WORKERS OF THE WORLD, UNITE!

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

No. 14

Price 10¢

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

ORGAN OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

Published twice a month in English, Russian, German, French, Chinese and Spanish.

VOL. XI | JULY 20, 1934 | No. 14

CONTENTS

Page

THE STRUGGLE FOR UNITY OF ACTION 455
By Bela Kun

THE FOREIGN POLICY OF GERMAN IMPERIALISM 458
By D. Gard

BRITISH IMPERIALISM PREPARING FOR WAR AND ITS COLONIAL CONTRADICTIONS 466
By R. Page Arnot

IMPERIALIST CONTRADICTIONS IN THE PACIFIC AND THE ARMAMENTS DRIVE 471
By Ivanov

SOME EXPERIENCES FROM THE ACTIVITY OF THE C.P. OF JAPAN IN THE ARMY 477

Workers Library Publishers, P. O. Box 148, Sta. D, New York City
Subscription price: one year, $2; six months, $1.

THE STRUGGLE FOR UNITY OF ACTION

By BELA KUN

DURING the last week three Communist Parties have approached Social-Democratic Parties with the proposal to organize joint activity to save the leader of the German proletariat, Comrade Ernst Thaelmann, from the hands of the fascist executioners. The struggle to save Thaelmann is a struggle to liberate all anti-fascist fighters in Germany, in Austria, and in all countries where fascism is triumphant. Communists have not hesitated for a minute when it has been a question of saving the lives of those anti-fascist fighters who were at one time in the ranks of Austrian social-democracy, or non-party workers, and who undertook a struggle against the oppressors of the working class.

The C.C. of the Communist Party of France has proposed to the Administrative Commission of the Socialist Party of France to organize joint demonstrations and protest meetings in a number of the chief industrial centers in the country, especially in those towns where there are consulates of Hitler's government.

The C.C. of the Communist Party of Switzerland has sent a delegation to the chairman of the Social-Democratic Party of Switzerland with a similar proposal, namely to organize joint demonstrations against German fascism with a view to saving Thaelmann.

The C.C. of the Communist Party of Great Britain has made a proposal in the same spirit to the Labor Party, and to the leading bodies of the reformist trade unions and the Co-operatives.

At a personal interview between the representatives of the Socialist Party of France and the C.P. of France, the social-democrats expressed their agreement with the Communist proposal *on condition that* during the period of joint activity the Communist Party will refrain from *any polemics* against the social-democrats. The representatives of the Communist Party expressed their *readiness* to *stop* all criticism of the social-democrats during the period of joint activity in every locality where protest demonstrations take place.

The Executive Commission of the Social-Democratic Party of Switzerland has sharply rejected the proposal of the Swiss Communist Party. As a characteristic of the unbearable tone of this reply, it is sufficient to give a single extract:

> "If the Communist Party of Switzerland calls on us to participate in demonstrations in front of the German embassy and consulates, we must demand that the Communist Party of Switzerland should hold demonstrations in front of the Russian consulates in those countries where it is possible."

It is needless to polemize against such proposals. Up to the moment when these lines are being penned (June 15, 1934) the leaders of the British Labor Party have not found time enough to reply to the proposal made by the Secretariat of the C.P. of Great Britain.

Snch are the facts. We only wish to add a few remarks to these facts. The bourgeoisie, especially the German fascists, correctly estimate the unity of action of the working class as the greatest danger for capitalism. They correctly estimate the personal importance of Comrade Thaelmann and the importance of his defense in the development of the anti-fascist struggle. In connection with the proposal of the C.P. of France to the French social-democrats, one of the leading journals of German big capital, the *Berliner Boerzenzeitung*, wrote that:

> "We here cannot remain indifferent to the fact that in order to 'save Thaelmann' the French Communists are preparing big meetings and street demonstrations in Paris, Rheims, Lille, Strassbourg, Bordeaux, Marseilles and other towns, and have even succeeded in inciting the French social-democrats to participate in this campaign and to form a united front."

For reasons not difficult to understand, the fascist journal attacks the movement to organize the united front of Communist and social-democratic workers. This attack is dictated by the interests of German fascism, and the interests of capitalism in general.

The very fact of such a reaction by Hitlerite fascism to the united front of the international proletariat which is developing against German fascism is sufficient to show that *in proposing to act in unison with the Social-Democratic Parties, the Communist Parties acted correctly.* This step is a correct one, not only because the Communist Parties have made this proposal repeatedly, despite the fact that after Hitler came to power the Second International forbade the Social-Democratic Parties to organize activity jointly with the Communists against Hitlerite fascism. The Second International acted in this way despite the fact that the Communist International, in its manifesto of March 5, 1933, proposed to its sections that they cease attacks on social-democracy during the period of joint activity. The significance of the new proposals made by the Communist Parties to the leading bodies of the Social-Democratic Par-

ties also does not consist only in the fact that Swiss social-democracy has again proved that it prefers class collaboration with the bourgeoisie to the united front with the Communist workers, that the British Labor Party has not even deigned to reply to the proposal for united action, and that the French Socialists have made the joint struggle against fascism dependent on conditions such as imply a violation of working class democracy.

At the present moment, as these lines are being written, we still do not know what decision the Administrative Commission of the Socialist Party of France will arrive at when it hears the report of its representatives who negotiated with the representatives of the Communist Party. We do not know which will prove a stronger influence on the Administrative Commission, the will of the working masses to struggle, of the masses who demand unity of action, or the opposition of Frossard, Dormy and Riviere, who rejected the proposal of the C.P. of France. But, irrespective of *what decision* the leaders of French social-democracy may adopt, irrespective of the decision *already adopted* by the leaders of Swiss social-democracy, and of the fact that the leaders of the British Labor Party *keep silent* and hide the matter from their members, *the Communist Parties will unswervingly continue and develop the struggle for the united front of the working class against fascism, against war, and to save Thaelmann.*

However hostile, following the example of the Swiss social-democrats, the reply of the social-democratic leaders may be to the proposal of the Communists to organize a joint united front of struggle, however they may foam at the mouth and declare the struggle against the split in the ranks of the working class to be a Communist maneuver, *for us Communists (and we hope for the masses of social-democratic and reformist workers also) the united front of the working class, the unity of action of the proletariat is and will continue to be a great and serious matter, a sacred matter.*

We Communists do not for a minute intend to abandon our political and organizational independence, and the independence of the Communist Party. We do not think it possible to unite the Communist International and the Second International. But we have firmly resolved with all our strength to strive for and to ensure the unity of action of the proletariat in the struggle against their class enemies.

Formerly, many social-democratic workers, members of the reformist trade unions and officers in these organizations did not understand this, but now, in face of the monstrously growing danger of fascism and war, they are realizing more and more that the Communists not only do not represent an obstacle in the path towards the establishment of the unity of the working class, but on the contrary contribute to this unity most of all.

Many social-democratic workers and officials were convinced by the manifesto of the Communist International of March 5, 1933, on the joint struggle against fascism and the capitalist offensive, that *the Communists are ready to make concessions in the interests of establishing the united front of the Communist and social-democratic workers against the bourgeoisie.* We state, openly and unreservedly that when we renounce polemics against the Social-Democratic Parties and our attacks on their policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie, this renunciation during the period of our joint actions against the capitalist offensive, against fascism and imperialist war, is a concession.

We make this concession although we are firmly convinced that our polemics against the supporters of class-collaboration with the bourgeoisie, are not only well founded, but *constitute an inseparable part of working class democracy.* By no means the least significant part of this working class democracy is the fact that the workers, who are class brothers but who have different views and convictions, must in the ideological struggle influence one another by the method of mutual conviction. Working class democracy means not only the right, but the duty and obligation to carry on such mutual conviction. And for this concession on our part, we do not demand anything else from the Social-Democratic Parties than that they should draw all the workers into the united front of our common struggle against the common class enemy.

We Communists will never abandon our principles and tactics—at any price. We shall never approve nor give our consent to collaboration between the working class and its class enemy, the bourgeoisie. We have advocated, we still advocate, and always will advocate the revolutionary overthrow of the power of the bourgeoisie, whatever its form, whether it is in the form of fascist power or in the form of capitalist democracy. We stand for the unlimited power of the working class, for the dictatorship of the proletariat, for Soviet power, which can only be established by the application of proletarian violence as an offset to the violence of the bourgeoisie, only by revolution. We have shown by the example of the Soviet Union that only the dictatorship of the proletariat, only Soviet power can bring about the widest democracy for all the toilers and clear the path for Socialism. But we have always called on those workers who do not share our views as yet on all these questions of principle, to fight along with us against our common class enemy, against the immediate dangers menacing the proletariat. On January 1, 1922, after the capitalist offensive on the working class had begun on an international scale, we addressed

the following appeal to the men and women of the proletariat of all countries:

> "Well, you cannot make up your minds yet to struggle along the whole front, to struggle for power, for dictatorship, with arms in your hands. You cannot yet make up your minds to deliver a decisive attack on the citadel of world reaction? At any rate, then, unite in the struggle for a piece of bread, in the struggle for peace. March together in a united army for the sake of this struggle, unite as a proletarian class against the class of exploiters and devastators of the world. Break down the barriers which have been raised between you, stand in united ranks irrespective of whether you are Communists or social-democrats, anarchists or syndicalists, so as to struggle against the hard poverty of the present day. The Communist International has always instructed the workers who stand for the dictatorship of the proletariat and for Soviets, to unite into independent parties. It does not withdraw a single word of what it has said on this matter proving the necessity for the formation of independent Communist Parties. It is convinced that every new day will more and more convince the working masses of the correctness of its actions. But despite all that disunites us, it says: Proletarians of the world, join your ranks for the struggle for the things which unite you, for the things which you look on as your common aim."

The Communists again repeat to the social-democratic and reformist workers and their officials: *Do you really not feel that the advance of fascism in a number of countries means the direct preparation of a new imperialist slaughter of the peoples, means the further worsening of the conditions of the working class?*

You follow your leaders, who, in our opinion, are carrying on an incorrect policy, a policy of *class collaboration*, a policy which is not in the interests of the proletariat but in the interests of the bourgeoisie. We consider that we are correct in criticizing your party, but our attacks on the policy of your leaders have not been an end in themselves for us. For us they have always been and still are a means of struggle for the establishment of the unity of the working class against capitalism. While striving to bring about the severance of the bonds of class collaboration which bind to the bourgeoisie such a large section of the working class as represented by the supporters of social-democracy, so that the social-democratic workers may be able to carry on a joint struggle together with us against the common enemy; while striving towards this minimum prerequisite for a successful struggle against fascism, we have declared and still declare our readiness to make this concession to your leaders. We firmly hope that even under the conditions of a temporary renunciation of *the important prerequisites of working class democracy*, the polemic against an incorrect policy, that the joint struggle of the Communist and social-democratic workers will convince the social-democratic workers that the only correct tactics for the working class are not reformist policy, not class collaboration with the class enemy, but the irreconcilable revolutionary class struggle against capitalism and its rule.

It follows from this conviction that no hostile or polite replies received from one or other Social-Democratic Party *can compel the Communist Parties to abandon this path of the consistent struggle for the unity of action of the proletariat.*

Irrespective of how the leading social-democratic bodies reply to our proposals for unity of action, we shall call on the workers, irrespective of the party they may belong to, to undertake joint actions against capitalism, fascism and imperialist war, in defense of the vital interests and rights of the working class. We are prepared to make proposals and we are also prepared to carry on negotiations with the leading bodies of the Social-Democratic Parties. But we know that our unswerving duty is not to make these proposals only to the Social-Democratic Party leaders, by carrying on negotiations behind the scenes. If some Communists do not yet understand this, they must now specially take into account the fact that *every proposal which we make to the Social-Democratic Party or reformist trade union leadership must be accompanied by hundreds of proposals to all the branches of the Social-Democratic Parties and reformist trade unions.* We must see that the supporters of the Social-Democratic Party, the members of the reformist trade unions, are widely informed by broad mass work about every proposal made by any Communist Party regarding joint actions against the class enemy. If Communists in France, Switzerland or Great Britain have lost sight of this and have not been able from day to day to present resolutions to the Social-Democratic Party organizations through their delegations, and to present them to the local trade union bodies or reformist trade union executives through Communist groups, if they have not been able to organize join open-air and indoor meetings of Communist and social-democratic workers, this is undoubtedly a mistake. Such militant actions for the establishment of unity of action, as proposals for a joint struggle to save Thaelmann, must be widely spread about in tens and hundreds of thousands of leaflets. Such militant measures must be accompanied by the resolutions of hundreds of Communist and social-democratic organizations and factory meetings. Only such a widely developed joint struggle of Communist and social-democratic workers and members of reformist and revolutionary trade unions, and the attraction of the broadest

strata of unorganized workers to this struggle, can bring about unity of action. It is necessary to make up in the nearest future for all that has been neglected until now in this campaign against fascism and to save Thaelmann. We shall fight untiringly for unity of action. And despite all we shall bring it about by struggle!

Again and again we repeat to the social-democratic workers: You do not know us Communists if you think that we shall stop half way. The struggle for the united front of the working class is included in the program of the Communist International, and we, whose words never differ from our deeds, take our program seriously. Despite all diplomatic evasions, despite sharp refusals of our proposals or the maintenance of silence about them, we shall appeal to you again and again, and propose that you should fight jointly with us against capitalism, against imperialist war, and against fascism, for our common class interests and for our direct demands.

And you, social-democratic workers, must also not stop half way. Join in the united front of the working class for victory over the class enemy.

THE FOREIGN POLICY OF GERMAN IMPERIALISM

By D. GARD

TWENTY years have passed since German imperialism threw itself into the World War with the confident belief that it would be able, by means of its army and its military power, to bring about the ancient dream of the German bourgeoisie. Long before 1914, the theoreticians of German imperialism had worked out in detail plans of annexations and conquests. Already at that time the theory of a people "without a territory" was widely used, and much was spoken of the great cultural mission of the German nation, which brought culture to the "lower races" at the point of the bayonet. Long before the World War, German economists used figures and diagrams to prove that the German people, which was "deprived of territory", needed conquests and the *extension* of its frontiers if it was to secure salvation and the possibility of development. The slogan that, "The future of Germany is on the seas" was launched at that time. Some tens of years have passed, and German imperialism of the fascist order has replaced this slogan by another one, namely that "The future of Germany is in the air". The Franz Herman type of national-socialist writers write "utopias of the immediate future", in which the German air squadrons conquer the Ukraine, India and Egypt.

German imperialism, thorough-going and solid even in its fantasies and dreams, had two alternative plans of political and military expansion on the eve of the World War. The first of these was directed towards the Near East and had in view German penetration at first in the Balkans, then to the Bosphorus and to Bagdad. Still further, the German imperialists dreamt of the shores of India and in the mists of the future, of world hegemony. This plan, the southeastern alternative, was carefully elaborated and thought out, and was carried into effect with exceptional energy. The second alternative plan of German imperialist expansion, the so-called "eastern" plan, became politically urgent only after the defeat on the Marne, when the German general staff became convinced of the impossibility of securing decisive military successes on the western front. Somewhat later, this "eastern" plan was given flesh and blood, was concretized in the shape of the occupation of the Ukraine. The German bourgeoisie counted on ending the war in the west as a draw, while at the same time seizing enormous territories in the east under the guise of Hetman rule over the Ukraine. It would, however, be a mistake to imagine that the famous "Ukrainian plan" of General Hoffman took shape in the brains of the German general staff and the German diplomats only during the war. In pre-war Germany the "Ukrainian problem" was dealt with in an extensive and instructive literature. The conception of including Ukraine in the sphere of Prussian influence was first advanced during the Crimean War in 1853, by a group of Prussian politicians under the leadership of Moritz von Bethman-Hollweg, who instructed the Prussian ambassador in London, Bunsen, to draw up a memorandum on the Ukraine. In it he developed the idea of the necessity of forming an independent Ukraine as a protectorate of Prussia. At the end of 1877, during the Russo-Turkish War, the Iron Chancellor, Bismarck, instructed his friend, the philosopher Edward Hartman, to publish an article in the journal *Die Gegenwart* on the necessity of thrusting Russia out to the east. Hartman advanced the plan of forming an independent Ukrainian State with frontiers running through Vitebsk, Kursk, Saratov, the Volga and Astrakhan. The hopes of putting this plan into action blossomed freely during the war, when scores of pamphlets dealing with the Ukraine were published. Among them were the works of Rohrback, Klainov, Schrupp and many others. Prof. Gensch wrote insistently in his works of the necessity of

forming an "Inter-Europe" (Zwischen-Europa). The Ukraine, according to this conception, opened the path to German imperialism across the Caucasus into Asia Minor, Syria, Mesopotamia and India. A certain A. Rudolph demanded the return to Germany of its historic "hunting grounds" which stretched, if we are to believe him, right up to the Urals. Martin Spann stated right at the beginning of the war that, "Our struggle in the East is not only romantic faithfulness to the ideal of the Niebelung, but a political assurance of the vital interests of the German race".

In 1918, German imperialism tried to carry out the eastern plan and suffered a double defeat, as follows: in the Ukraine at the hand of the proletarian revolution, and in the west from the proletarian revolution and the army of the Entente. The German bourgeoisie, who imagined that they had taken every factor into account, left out of account in addition a factor like the German proletariat. The robber dreams of the imperialists which had been paid for in the blood and sufferings of millions of toilers, shamefully collapsed. German monopolist capital, defeated in the World War and compelled to sign the Versailles Treaty, appeared to have been removed for a long time from active participation on the imperialist stage.

After the failure in 1923 of its so-called passive resistance in the Ruhr Region, Germany began to fulfil the obligations put on it by the Versailles Treaty. In the sphere of foreign politics—an era of "pacifism" set in. In estimating the policy of this so-called Stressmann period, we should take as our starting point the fact that the bourgeois circles behind Stressmann had by no means given up the idea of restoring the power of German imperialism. This has not prevented the Hitlerites from accusing the politicians of the Weimar period of "internationalism", of betraying the interests of the nation, etc. But Stressmann and Bruening were no less convinced imperialists than the present rulers of the Third Empire. At the same time it would be a mistake to over-simplify the situation, and regard the foreign policy of Weimar Germany as being identical with that of the Hitler regime.

Stressmann, and within certain limits also General von Seckt, and von Schleicher, who played a very important role in the foreign policy of Germany before the Hitler period, regarded the struggle against Versailles as a lengthy process, and took into account that the restoration of the power of German imperialism would take place very slowly, and would pass through numerous stages. Germany must not reckon on rapid big successes, but on the small but sure results of everyday diplomatic activity. Stressmann constructed his policy on a view which envisaged this process of the restoration of the power of German imperialism as extending over a long period. During this period, as Stressmann presumed, German imperialism would have to play a subordinate role, dragging in the wake of British or French imperialism. Gradually, however, Germany would free itself from the burden weighing her down, and the time would come when, as a result of its small successes, German imperialism would come out on to the broad path of expansion and struggle for the noted "place in the sun" Stressmann consistently carried on this policy. Though an open imperialist before the defeat of Germany, he came out after the signing of the Versailles Treaty as an equally ardent pacifist, and a loyal supporter of the League of Nations. Following the line of "conciliation", Stressmann was able to secure some concrete results, such as the withdrawal of military control, the withdrawal of the military control commissions, the evacuation of all three occupied zones, and later began negotiations for the solution of the Saar problem before it was due. The development of events seemed to justify Stressmann's tactics. Germany slowly but surely came out on to the broad imperialist path.

Other German politicians of the military type, especially von Seckt, were rather sceptical of these calculations of Stressmann. They did not believe that the restoration of the power of German imperialism could proceed entirely along such a path of evolution. These German bourgeois politicians considered that there was a definite limit to the voluntary concessions made by France, beyond which France would not go. First of all Germany could not reckon on having the right to equality in armaments recognized. By taking the path of "small business", Germany could not obtain decisive results. Nevertheless, Seckt and the others did not reject the tactics of Stressmann, and considered that Germany had no alternative but the policy of "conciliation" (Verstaendegungspolitik). In such conditions, however, the chief reliance must be placed on the international situation, on the absolutely inevitable sharpening of the contradictions between the victorious powers. Germany must wait for the clashing of these contradictions, and show the greatest caution and restraint until this moment. At that point, however, when the international atmosphere became heated to a definite point, Germany, which would have carried out all the preparatory work, would proceed to restore its military power at rapid speed and would come out onto the broad imperialist highway. The prerequisites for this were to be the maintenance of freedom of action for Germany, for which the policy of balancing between the West and the East is vitally necessary. It requires what they liked to call the "Russian card" in Berlin, naively and confidently believing that the foreign policy of the Soviet Union was simply a passive card in the hands of the cunning and cau-

tious German player. At the same time, very much was done to creat the economic prerequisites for future armaments. In the secret cupboard of certain industrial enterprises, and in the pigeon-holes of the Reichswehr, the designs for the construction of all kinds of armaments were preserved. As a military reserve, extensive financial aid was given to the "Steel Helmets", and even the social-democratic "Republican Flag" organization was looked on as a military organization in the rough.

The policy of Stressmann, as well as von Seckt's alternative, had in view, as we have stated, activity stretching over a lengthy period, and the use of cautious methods, the repudiation of adventurist experiments. A necessary condition for the carrying out of this foreign policy was the preservation of parliamentarism and the utilization of social-democracy with a view to the all-round deception of the proletarian masses. The blows of the economic crisis undermined the foundations of this reformist pacifist policy, with an ever-increasing force. The death of Stressmann was a kind of symbol in this respect. German monopolist capital became convinced that it was illusory to calculate on a foreign policy carried out at a slow tempo. A process of the rearming and regrouping of the forces of the German bourgeoisie began. The Bruening Government already made a change in tactics both in the sphere of home and foreign politics as seen in the speeding up of the offensive against the working class on the one hand and in the activization of diplomatic activity on the other hand. The attempt to bring about the Anschluss—the signing of the Kurzius-Schauber protocol in the spring of 1931, was a manifestation of this new line.

As is known, this policy broke down. Papan came to power, and the German bourgeoisie made an attempt to get out of the impasse by bringing about a military alliance with France directed against the U.S.S.R., in the sphere of foreign policy, and by bringing about a regime of fascist dictatorship directed against the working class, in home politics.

However, the conditions became more and more threatening. German capitalism began to totter more and more, and to crumble away under the blows of the crisis. A new revolutionary wave began to grow. In the autumn of 1932, the Communist Party won millions of new voters, and a wave of strikes developed against the Papen law on wage cuts, a wave which reached its highest point in the Berlin transport workers' strike. German monopolist capital was forced to adopt a serious decision and to use its reserve, namely, the fascist National-Socialist Party.

The German bourgeoisie gave the following twofold and very responsible mission to Hitler and his staff: In the sphere of home politics the national-socialists were to destroy the Communist Party and to weaken the revolutionary menace with the aid of blood-letting; while in the sphere of foreign politics they were to carry out a policy of emerging from the crisis along the path of war. The National-Socialist Party came to power with a program worked out in detail for an expansionist foreign policy, as set out in a number of documents, especially in Hitler's *My Struggle,* the bible of national-socialism, and in the *Future Path of German Foreign Policy.* At the basis of the foreign political conception of the national-socialist strategists was and is the idea of a military alliance, and moreover, exclusively an offensive one. Hence, Hitler makes it his basic task to make Germany "capable of alliance" (bundnisfähig).

For this purpose the following prerequisites are necessary, namely:—*a regime of unlimited terrorist dictatorship in Germany, potential allies and basis for alliance.* The first of these prerequisites, set out by Hitler himself, was immediately created by the national-socialists. The potential allies were also decided on in advance by the national-socialist leaders, and were to have been in the first place Great Britain and Italy. In order to attract the former to participate in a military alliance, Germany had to make the Britishers believe that national-socialist Germany had forever abandoned all the ideas of rivalry with Great Britain. This, of course, was still in sufficient to draw in Great Britain, and Hitler expected to utilize the traditional policy of the balance of power applied by Great Britain, which at the given moment was interested in preventing France from increasing its role to that of a world power. Therefore, Great Britain was to support fascist Germany against France, which had become a menace to British interests. However, Hitler understood that all this edifice was without a firm basis. He therefore placed a foundation under the idea of a British-German military alliance, in the shape of the preparation of an anti-Soviet war. Thus, Hitler's conception amounts to the following: Great Britain, which is interested in weakened France, cannot, nevertheless, permit the strengthening of Germany in the West. It consistently conducts an anti-Soviet policy and strives towards the annihilation of the U.S.S.R. Finally, Great Britain understands that the path for expansion must be opened to German imperialism, otherwise an explosion is inevitable. The anti-Soviet plan satisfies all these demands.

Thus a basis is formed for Germany's active foreign policy. Germany can come out onto the broad highway of aggression and territorial plunder only along the line of anti-Soviet war. This is the basis on which the Ukrainian plan is built in the foreign policy of German fascism, which reproduces the line of the German general staff of the period of the end of the World War. The national-socialists are the lawful heirs of the pre-war type of German im-

perialism, and have adopted the "Ukrainian alternative" of Bunsen, Hartman and General Hoffmann. The theory of "A people without territory", "A nation without space" has been brought to the forefront again.

Hitler writes:

> "We must find the courage to unite our people, to collect their forces for a movement along the path which will bring Germany out of the present limitations of the living area for the people to a new territory, and thus liberate it forever from the danger of perishing on this land.
>
> "The gigantic struggle of 1914-1918 was lost because the German people entered it without being in essence a world power. It was and still is at the present time a country on our planet in which the relationship between the size of the population and the size of the territory is unusually pitiful. In the epoch when the land was completely divided between the states, it was impossible to speak of the world role of a country whose territory was limited to a pitiful area of only about half a million square kilometers."

Further, Hitler states that:

> "The frontiers of a state are formed by people and are changed by people. The fact that some nation is able to possess an enormous territory does not mean that this fact will be recognized forever." (Retranslated from the Russian.)

Even before he came to power, Hitler finished off all the details and explained what territory he was speaking about:

> "We national-socialists begin where Germany stopped six centuries ago. We are completing the century-long movement of the German race to the South and West of Europe and are turning our gaze to the lands of the East. We are finishing with the commercial and colonial policy of pre-war and when we speak today of new lands in Europe and the districts under its power, we have in view Russia and the territory under its control."

Hitler considers that the government of Wilhelm made many mistakes when it spoiled its relations with other countries. "For one thing only it does not deserve censure, and that is that it did not maintain good relations with Russia."

Rosenberg in his books gives a philosophic foundation to Hitler's foreign political conception, and, moreover, he openly emphasizes that the destruction of the Polish State is a prime necessity for Germany. Further, Rosenberg has stated that the conquest of Poland and Ukraine is an intermediate link towards a further policy of annexations directed towards the Caucasus, Persia and Syria.

Such was the programmatic line with which the national-socialists came to power, a line which cannot be called inconsistent. It would, however, be a mistake to regard the foreign political plan of the Third Empire as being simply a repetition of the so-called "Ukrainian alternative" of the pre-war plan of German imperialism. For whereas for the latter the conquest of the Ukraine was equivalent to a seizure of territory, for fascist Germany a war against the U.S.S.R. would not only be an act of foreign policy, but also one of home policy. It represents a struggle against Communism, against the citadel of the world revolution, the Soviet Union. The aggressive foreign policy of German fascism fully correspondents to its home policy, the crushing of the proletariat and the struggle against the revolutionary movements, and the attempt to drown them in blood. Further, the "Eastern plan" of the national-socialists differs from the pre-war projects in that under conditions when the world is closely approaching a new, second round of revolutions and wars it is regarded by the German bourgeoisie as the only path of salvation for capitalist Germany. This is the main difference in principle between the national-socialist anti-Soviet plans, and the "Ukrainian conception" of pre-war German imperialism.

The national-socialists came to power on January 30, 1933, with such a program. Immediately after their victory they began to carry out their anti-Soviet policy, including the moral preparations of the petty-bourgeois mass for an anti-Soviet war, and slander against the U.S.S.R., as well as the negotiations of Rosenberg in London and the famous Hugenberg memorandum. The national-socialists calculated that their victory and the declaration of their readiness to stand at the head of an anti-Soviet bloc would immediately cause the latter to crystallize, and that in the process of the preparations for an anti-Soviet war, Germany would be able to re-arm herself. The first calculations were a fiasco, being dictated not so much by properly formed ideas as by the intoxication of victory at home. Six months before he came to power, Hitler explained in a letter to von Papen that a prerequisite for an active German foreign policy was increased armaments.

On October 16, 1933, a sharp change took place in the foreign political course of Germany. The national-socialists concentrated all their efforts on armaments, temporarily leaving everything else on one side. As a result, Germany resigned from the League of Nations and left the disarmament conference, and we saw the beginning of a stage in the struggle for armaments, concealed by the smoke-screen of impudent "pacifism" and demagogy. The national-socialist leaders permitted themselves to make statements which would have cost Stressmann his life had he dared to make them. First of all, a complete *volte face* took place in respect to Poland.

In the program principles of the national-socialists, the destruction of Poland was regarded as the first stage of an "active" policy, and in the first few months of the national-socialist regime, German-Polish relations took on a most tense character, and the landing of Polish troops on Westerplatt threatened a serious conflict. But the second half of 1933 saw a period of flirting between Germany and Poland. First of all the national-socialists in Danzig declared their loyalty to Poland, and then the Hitler-Lipsky declaration on non-aggression was published. Finally, a treaty was signed on the repudiation of violence, and a "moral pact" of non-aggression was concluded providing for mutual control over the press and radio material. An era of touching German-Polish friendship set in. Such a policy is easy to understand from the point of view of Germany. Germany needs first of all to provide for the safety of the Eastern frontier while she is re-arming herself. Then it is very important for her to make a breach in the French system of alliances, and to strike a heavy blow at France. Finally, owing to her rapprochement with Poland, fascist Germany can demonstrate her loyalty to peace.

The foreign policy of Polish imperialism has a much more complicated under-structure. The Polish bourgeoisie, taught by the bitter experience of the Four-Power Pact, have decided to insure themselves against all eventualities and, as Herenschaft, the German correspondent in Warsaw, has expressed it, to ride simultaneously on three horses. Poland is trying to maintain an alliance with France and at the same time to establish close collaboration with Germany. As a result, a situation has arisen in which the "faithful" ally of France supports the policy of Berlin on the question of armaments which are directed against France. Further, Poland has evidently given Germany a guarantee in one form or another that it will not hinder the bringing about of the Anschluss at the moment when Germany considers this to be advisable.

However, it would be a gross mistake to lose sight of a tendency among some influential circles of the Polish bourgeoisie, including those near to Pilsudski, who consider that the present form of German-Polish relations is not sufficient, and who are trying to find a common language with Germany on the basis of an anti-Soviet policy. The adherents of this idea link up their calculations with the chances of an attack on the U.S.S.R. by Japanese imperialism, and are working out a plan for making appropriate use of the situation together with Germany.

Thus, the question at issue is the attempt of Poland to come to terms with Germany regarding the Corridor and Silesia, on the basis of an anti-Soviet policy. National-socialist strategists insistently support this tendency of certain Polish circles, because they know that the first stage of German-Polish military collaboration will under any circumstances be the occupation of Poland by the German army. These perspectives do not escape the sight of the cautious circles of the Polish bourgeoisie who are afraid of the catastrophic results of a policy of adventures.

However this may be, national-socialist Germany has made excellent use of the Polish maneuver, and has struck a serious blow at the position of France on the question of armaments. At the same time, the very unfavorable position of England has been made clear. In the Far East, Great Britain is interested on the one hand in the weakening of its basic rival, the U. S. A., and on the other hand it fears too great a strengthening of Japan, which is a menace to the vital interests of Great Britain. In such circumstances, Great Britain tries to direct Japanese aggression against the U.S.S.R. In Europe, British imperialism is trying to create a relationship of forces which wauld permit Great Britain to play the role of deciding factor, and would guarantee the safety of her rear, thus ensuring freedom of action in the Pacific. Great Britain had calculated that as a result of the World War, France and Germany would be equally weakened and that a balance of power would be created which would fully correspond to British interest. These calculations, however, proved to be mistaken. French imperialism restored its forces at a relatively high speed, and France began to lay claim to the role of a World Power, building up its military hegemony in capitalist Europe on a powerful army and a system of military alliances. As a result, a very complicated position arose for Great Britain, and it became necessary to have another strong continental factor as an offset to France. This explains the support given by Great Britain to the German bourgeoisie during the last few years.

Nevertheless, Great Britain reckoned on the process of the restoration of Germany's military power taking place slowly so that London would always be able to regulate it according to its own interests at any given moment. The coming of the national-socialists to power shattered these calculations of Great Britain, and put it in a very unfavorable position. It should be kept in mind that besides its strivings to play the role of arbitrator in European matters, Great Britain was also forced to reckon on other circumstances. First of all Great Britain cannot at the present moment allow an armed Franco-German conflict to take place as she would inevitably be involved, in view of her Locarno obligations and of course mainly by reason of her vital interests. This in turn would mean a blow at the British Empire as the Dominions in 1925 demonstratively refused to sign the Locarno pact. Further, Great Britain cannot permit the destruction of Germany, because this would mean the breakdown of

German capitalism. Finally, the British imperialists understand quite well that an armed Germany would be a very serious danger for Great Britain itself. The time has passed when Great Britain felt itself to be completely out of danger behind the protecting guns of its battleships. Germany military aviation could make Great Britain pass through very serious trials. First of all Great Britain has determinedly resisted all attempts at the preventative destruction of Germany. At the same time Great Britain has put pressure on Germany with the help of the anti-Hitler debates in the House of Commons in the summer of 1933. At the beginning of October 1933, British policy took a line in the direction of France on the question of German armaments, and it was decided to revise the plan of MacDonald in a direction which was worse for Germany. When Germany resigned from the League of Nations and left the Disarmament Conference, this placed Britain in a difficult position, depriving it of the role of arbitrator and transforming it into one of the participants in the struggle being conducted on the question of armaments. In its memorandum of January 29, 1934, Great Britain took the line of equality of rights for Germany in armaments.

Under the pressure of Great Britain and also of Italy, France became convinced that it could not reckon on Poland, which was adopting a waiting policy and was playing a double game. France decided to enter into direct negotiations with Germany on the question of armaments. These negotiations, which took the form of concessions between Francois Poncier and Hitler, and also the exchange of notes and memorandums, lasted until April 16, 1934, when the French Government in its note to Great Britain stated its decision to break off negotiations and to refuse to legalize German armaments. At the same time France attempted to obtain from Great Britain an extension of its Locarno guarantees. According to the French conception, Britain should guarantee the safety not only of France and Belgium, but of all France's allies. Further, Britain should guarantee the fulfilment of a convention on German armaments if this should be signed. The British undertakings should be fixed in the form of automatic sanctions—economic, diplomatic and military.

Great Britain absolutely refused to widen the framework of the Locarno undertakings which it was rather trying to narrow down. The refusal of Great Britain to give guarantees and sanctions fully corresponds to British foreign policy in Europe. Great Britain considers that the only way out is the re-arming of Germany and the restoration of German military power within certain limits. France must not be subject to attacks from Germany but must sacrifice its allies, at whose expense the annexationist appetite of German imperialism will be partly satisfied. After this, though France preserved its military power, it will be isolated, and be completely dependent on British support and aid. Thus, Britain is trying to solve its basic Continental task, namely the establishment of the balance of power, by means of which Great Britain will play the role of super-arbiter.

At the same time, British imperialism reckons with the fact that Germany must be compensated and supplied with territory, even if only temporarily. This must partly be done through the Anschluss and at the expense of Czechoslovakian territory, but in the main at the expense of the "Eastern territories" (the famous "Ostraum"). On this point certain circles of the British bourgeoisie give full support to the Hitler-Rosenberg plan. This line in British foreign policy was shown fairly plainly during the June session of the general commission and of the bureau of the disarmament conference. Nevertheless, France decided once more to try to force Great Britain to change its policy and at Geneva was prepared to compromise on the question of security and regional pacts. This policy, as later events showed, brought some positive results to France.

Germany is carrying out a reckless policy of arming itself, by taking advantage of Poland's maneuvers and the support of Great Britain and Italy. Without waiting for the time when the equality of Germany will be recognized in some official document, Germany is arming itself at a most intense speed. For a whole year, hundreds of industrial enterprises have been re-equipping themselves, mobilization reserves of military raw materials have been established, a tremendous amount of work is being performed for the development of military aviation, and extensive underground airports are being established in a number of points, especially in East Prussia. At the same time, preparations are being made to enlarge the Reichswehr to 300,000, and at the same time it is also proposed to set up a so-called "big" army on the principle of combining the volunteer army with one based on conscription.

The core of the Reichswehr has to remain the professional cadres. The National Socialists are attempting to win the sympathy of the Reichswehr, by the policy which its regime is pursuing of arming the country, advancing war credits and preparing to enlarge the army. The national-socialists have further been able to attract the young officers to themselves by cutting down the period required for promotion. Simultaneously, for a year and a half, purely military preparations have been going on in the form of intensive psychological preparations for war through the inflaming of animal nationalism and the racial theory, which justify the right of the German race to conquer and subject other peoples,

The task of Germany on the question of armaments is by no means to reach the level of military power of France. Fascist Germany needs the creation of such a volume of human and military technical resources for two or three months as would enable it to carry on a "defensive" war, so that by the end of this period she could fully utilize the enormous possibilities of her war industry to take up the offensive. The national-socialists are consistently carrying out this plan, and the negotiations which they are conducting on the question of armaments have a double aim, namely either German armaments will be legalized or the negotiations will serve as a smokescreen to hide the feverish rearming of Germany. *In two or three years German imperialism will not need any conventions or legalization, as it will secure equality of armaments by direct action, without regard to legal forms.*

There can be no doubt that German imperialism has some very powerful levers in its hands. First of all, there is the feeling that it is immune from punishment, thanks to the fear of the capitalist powers that a proletarian revolution may take place in Germany. Further, a tremendous role is played by the tremendous industrial possibilities of Germany for war production. Finally, international conditions favor Germany's aggressive plans to a certain extent. The maneuvers of Great Britain, which has decided to utilize the German armaments in its own interests, the policy of Poland, in which adventurist tendencies are growing stronger, the support of Italy to Germany—all these things in certain conditions may create a state of affairs in Europe resembling that in the Pacific. Just as Japan is incomparably weaker than the U.S.A. and Great Britain as an imperialist power, but is carrying out its policy of annexation and not meeting with resistance, so German imperialism in the conditions of the general crisis of capitalism, in the heated atmosphere of the preparations for war, is bringing about that which it was unable to secure in 1914-15. The strength of German imperialism lies in the fact that while a number of imperialist countries do not expect to win anything from war and wish to avoid it, while others are trying to switch the war danger onto lines more profitable to them. German imperialism knows what it wants and will not stop at anything, ignoring all its international undertakings to burst through onto the broad highroad of imperialist aggression. The German imperialists are trying to utilize the experience of their Japanese friends and it is not surprising that the latter are so dear to the national-socialist leaders. In such circumstances, Germany is becoming just such a center of the war danger in Europe as imperialist Japan is in the Far East.

As we have already mentioned, German imperialism has a number of useful levers at its disposal in its policy of preparing to remake the map of Europe, a policy which is only to serve as the prelude to the remaking of the map of the world. At the same time, however, there are extremely vulnerable spots in the foreign political line of German imperialism. Firstly it should be remembered that all the economic experiments of the German Government have collapsed. The country stands on the brink of financial catastrophe. The complete stoppage of the payment of all debts, including the Dawes and Young loans has placed the financial boycott of Germany on the order of the day. The British reply note on the question of the German moratorium caused a tremendous impression among leading circles of the German bourgeoisie, and has compelled the German government to capitulate.

Simultaneously, so-called radical sentiments among the national-socialist rank and file have begun to grow up, and the talk of the "second revolution" has grown louder. Vice-Chancellor Papen on June 17 made a speech in Marburg which caused such a furore. In passing we may remark that the speech was composed not by him but by a journalist called Jung, closely connected with leading industrial circles. Two days later Goering made the same proposals. They both demanded that the government should cease its dangerous economic experiments and carry on a so-called "sound policy" which would consist of a decisive attack on the standards of living of the working class and the petty bourgeoisie; the artificial policy of struggle against unemployment and the support of hundreds of thousands of storm troops by the government must be stopped; there must be no more talk of parcelling up the big estates, and the law on the inheritance of peasant farms must be repealed.

Decisive pressure was simultaneously put on Hitler from several points—from the Junkers and the heavy industrial magnates, especially Krupp, von Bollen and Thyssen, and also the Reichswehr which came out on to the political foreground and which saw in the Storm Detachments a severe threat to their vital interests, especially as regards the rearmament of Germany. It is no chance that not a single commander of the S.A. was admitted into the Reichswehr for several months, whereas every patronage was given to the Steel Helmets. It is no chance that the bayonets and machine guns of the Reichswehr stood behind the carbines and mausers of the police.

Carrying out the will of their masters, Goering and Hitler carried through a new St. Bartholomew's Eve on June 30, and shot the leaders of the Storm Troops. The version about a plot in which Roehm, Schleicher and Strasser took part is a fairy tale with which the national-socialist leaders are trying to cover up their real plans. By shooting Roehm, Strasser and scores of other Storm Troop commanders, Hitler struck a blow at the main bulwark of fascism.

German monopolist capital is compelled to rely more than ever on the bayonets of the Reichswehr and the Praetorian Guards, the Defense Guard Detachments.

German fascism had entered on the path of catastrophe and a further intensification of the internal struggle. June 30 is followed by new bloody events, new plots and shootings. German fascism had not solved a single one of the tasks facing German capitalism, and is unable to solve them.

The Communist Party is reaching ever wider masses of the proletariat and is marching towards victory. It is no chance that in his speech in the Reichstag on July 13, Hitler spoke of the necessity of carrying on a hundred years' struggle against Communism.

The German bourgeoisie reckoned on utilizing the eevnts of June 30 as a big positive factor in its foreign policy. The Third Empire would demonstrate its victory over the radical elements, its capability to negotiate regarding rearmament. Reality has completely upset these calculations. The leading bourgeois circles not only in France, but in Great Britain, are taking account of the instability of the fascist regime in Germany and are afraid of the possibility that it may go in for adventures. Before the June events and the negotiations between Simon and Barthou, British imperialism thought it possible to begin to carry out its plan for ensuring the leading role of Britain as super-arbitrator in Europe. It has soon, however, become clear that such a policy is fraught with the most dangerous consequences for British interests, and in Parliament, Sir John Simon has spoken in favor of the U.S.S.R. joining the League of Nations while the British Ambassador in Berlin has made a demarche to the German Government in Germany becomes more plain. Just as Sir fascist Germany *has found itself in an exceptionally difficult position.*

All this together does not mean that British imperialism has abandoned its plans and above all its anti-Soviet aims. It is only trying to gain time and is waiting for the moment when the relationship of forces becomes clear, when the direction of development in Germany becomes more plain. Just as Sir Edward Grey on the eve of the World War gave significant hints of support to the German and the French ambassadors, so at the present time British diplomacy supports German policy as regards armaments and is at the same time making concessions to France.

However complicated the international situation may be, of one thing there can be no doubt whatever, and that is that the foreign policy of the third empire will fully preserve its aggressive character after the events of June 30 as well. The German fascist regime stands forth in all its nakedness, unconcealed by any mask, before the working class and the toiling masses. The question "where next" will arise before the leaders of the German bourgeoisie with ever more menacing and insistent force. The crumbling of the mass base of the fascist dictatorship will force the German bourgeoisie to attempt ever new twists and turns. The events which have taken place are a manifestation of the internal weakness of the counter revolution, which is frantic with terror. The impossibility of finding a way out of the impasse along economic lines will continue to drive German imperialism as before or with still greater force along the path of foreign political adventures. In its foreign policy German monopolist capital has many strong levers at its disposal. However, to carry out this policy, German fascism needs time and delay, which it is not granted. The growth of the revolutionary forces inside the country, and the struggle for power in the fascist camp, will compel the German bourgeoisie to hasten the speed of the preparations for war. German imperialism will try to save itself in the flames of a new world conflagration, and place the fate of capitalism in the melting pot.

BRITISH IMPERIALISM PREPARING FOR WAR AND ITS COLONIAL CONTRADICTIONS

By R. PAGE ARNOT

BRITISH imperialism is preparing for war, increasing her armaments and making diplomatic, economic and financial moves in every part of the world. Again, as before 1914, British imperialism is preparing for war in every way. But it is no longer the same world: the general crisis of capitalism has had a profoundly disintegrating effect on the oldest capitalist country, and its colonial empire. The Soviet Union holds one-sixth of the globe as the citadel of the world revolution. Soviet power has also been established over a large part of China. New antagonisms have arisen amongst the imperialist powers. New rivals of British imperialism have come to the forefront.

Nor is it any longer the same empire. Deep and rending contradictions are developing and putting entirely new problems before the British bourgeoisie. The centrifugal tendencies of the British dominions: the anti-imperialist revolutionary movements in the colonies and semi-colonies of Britain, and the growth of the revolutionary working class movement at home, have tremendously altered the whole situation.

The main antagonisms are clear. British imperialism, backing Japan and Germany, organizes the war drive against the U.S.S.R. and gets itself to hinder the operation of the peace policy of the Soviet Union. In the second place, within the capitalist world, British imperialism makes one after another long-range moves against its powerful imperialist rival, the United States of America. In the third place, contradictions exist between British and French imperialism, and in the camp of the instigators of war, namely, between Britain, Japan and Germany. Germany refuses to pay the interest due under the Dawes Plan and the Young Plan. Japan becomes a powerful trade competitor of Great Britain, especially in the colonial markets. Italy clashes with Britain in the Mediterranean colonies.

It is an undoubted fact that the interests of British imperialism clash everywhere with the interests of other powers. That "far flung battle line" of British imperialism comprises not only the empire of 1914, but the new mandated territories of the Middle East, and the warships that guard British interests on the China station, and the interests of the allied empires of Portugal and the Netherlands.

The British Empire comprises over thirteen million square miles, with a population of four hundred and ninety-five millions, divided as follows:—

	Area in square miles	Population
Great Britain and Northern Ireland	94,663	46,386,000
Europe	27,125	3,241,000
Africa	3,820,274	57,995,000
America	4,008,214	13,091,000
Australia	3,278,917	9,347,000
Asia (other than India)	317,584	12,558,000
India	1,808,274	352,383,000
Total	13,355,426	495,456,000

Of this official total empire population no less than five-sevenths is India.

But this total hides the fact that a number of "independent" and "sovereign" States are entirely under British control. Egypt, with a population of fourteen and a quarter millions, was formally declared to be "independent" in 1930 (the British Protectorate had been "terminated" in 1922) but "*Defense is reserved and remains under British control*" says the *Statesman's Year Book*. Actually there is a British army of occupation about twelve thousand strong, while the chief officers of the Egyptian army are British. This is what is meant by "independence" as granted by Mr. Arthur Henderson when he was Foreign Secretary of British imperialism.

Similar is the case of Iraq. British imperialism "terminated" its mandate in 1932—but the British air force remains stationed in Iraq.

Similarly with "independent Arabia", whose many monarchs are mostly in the pay and under the control of Britain.

Altogether these various independent territories, including Tibet and the Himalayan States, with those already mentioned, swell the total size of the British Empire by over two million square miles. To this again must be added the territories of the junior imperialisms, which Britain reckons on having to defend by "the King's Ships", namely, the three-quarters of a million square miles of the Dutch East Indies with a population of nearly sixty-one million, and the Portuguese Empire of over

three-quarters of a million square miles, bringing the real grand total under British imperialism to nearly seventeen million square miles, containing well-nigh six hundred million of mankind.

THE BRITISH DOMINIONS

War greatly accelerated the growth of these extensions of the British capitalist system until now the tendency to independent economic policies has been expressed also in a frequent tension between Great Britain and the Dominions, and in resulting political concession from Whitehall. Moreover, the influence of American capital has grown in the Dominions. Capital exports from the U.S.A. into Canada grew rapidly in the post-war years. Wall Street proved ready to float an Austrian loan when the City of London tried to exercise financial control. Eventually, beginning with the signature of the Halibut Treaty by both the diplomatic representatives of Canada and the British Ambassador to U.S.A., the Dominions, headed by the Hertzog Government of South Africa, insisted on a constitutional definition of their co-equality with the Government of Britain. The Statute of Westminster passed a few years ago registered the extent to which these centrifugal tendencies of the Dominions had developed

In the special case of Ireland, the oldest colony, which has now been given the name of a Dominion, British imperialism maintains its warships in all the Irish harbors and waterways and wages a bitter economic warfare with the Irish Free State.

During the world economic crisis, Downing Street tried to recover some of its hold over the Dominions by means of financial pressure through the Bank of England. It was partly successful in Australia, while in the case of New Zealand, the subjection to British finance capital is still more complete. In Newfoundland, where a popular revolt compelled the Dominion bourgeoisie to call on the armed forces of the British Crown, the right of self-governing Dominion status has been "temporarily" surrendered: and that colony strategically placed under the lee of North America, is now being governed by a Commission directly appointed by His Majesty's Government.

What would be the attitude of these Dominions if the antagonisms in the Pacific developed into war between Japanese imperialism and American imperialism? Britain has been and is now backing Japan. For twenty years up to 1922 a formal military alliance existed betwen Britain and Japan, until the Washington Conference. But the belief that a secret understanding exists up to this very day between these two powers is frequently voiced in the American press: and is borne out by events of the last three years. Before 1914 a declaration of war by His Majesty's Government involved all the Dominions; but now their separate assents must be received. Nor is this mere form. In the autumn of 1922, when Lloyd George threatened war with Turkey at Chanak, the Dominion of Canada made it clear that it would not participate.

Would assent be given to support of Japan by the Dominions? The whole tendency of Canada, Australia and New Zealand was against Japan, even during the currency of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance. Canada's policy towards Japan has been similar to that of the United States. For over thirty years, Australian Governments have proclaimed the "White Australia" policy against Japanese immigration. This antagonism has by no means been weakened.

Lastly, support by Britain of Japan in a Japanese-American war would find a large section of the Irish Free State backing America. The attitude of the de Valera Government to Britain depends largely on the United States. The American government is very keenly aware of this situation: it is no accident that the American Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Kellogg, had no desire to visit London while at the same time paying a ceremonial visit to the capital of Ireland.

Efforts are being made to counteract the anti-Japanese line of the capitalists in the Dominions. A trade mission has gone from Australia to Japan which has been hailed as "Australia's best customer for wool" and an Australian Legation has been established in Tokio. But whatever softening of antagonisms is expected from these efforts is very largely offset by the hostility which has arisen between cotton and other manufacturing interests within Britain itself. In the case of Canada, much American stock has been repaid; and in this last year Canadian loans have been floated in London. Newfoundland has been brought under administrative control of Britain, and New Zealand under financial control. Nevertheless the centrifugal tendency remains.

An Anglo-American war, therefore, even in the partial stage of an American-Japanese war in the Pacific, brings up sharply before the British imperialists the problem of Dominion support and of empire disintegration.

But there is one war in which capitalists in every Dominion would be fully united with Britain. All the Dominions have shown themselves in full agreement with the anti-Soviet policy of the British Government. The capitalists of Canada, itself a secondary imperialist power, even took the lead two years ago in pressing for a breach of Anglo-Soviet trade relations. Likewise in Australia the Labor Prime Minister of New South Wales, Lang, the "Leftist of the Lefts", joined in the slave-labor cam-

paign against the Soviet Union. In South Africa, where the whole policy of the South African capitalists is concentrated on the oppression of the natives, a single "nationalist" party has now been formed by Smuts and Hertzog, to hold down the natives: and there also the influence of the Soviet Union's example is dreaded. The Irish Free State, strongly under the influence of the Pope, who launched the anti-Soviet religious campaign of 1930, would be nothing loath to see the end of Communism in the Soviet Union.

Under such circumstances, it is not surprising that the problem of the centrifugal tendency of the Dominions is one of the factors that has dictated Britain's present tactics of organizing a war drive against the Soviet Union, backing Japan and Germany and striving to extend the anti-Soviet front.

THE COLONIES

But the Dominions are only the first part of the new problem.

Whereas in the Dominions centrifugal tendencies had begun to show themselves, though in a less marked degree, before the war of 1914, the anti-imperialist movement in the colonies is almost entirely a product of the years after 1914. The twentieth century's first decade had seen the awakening of the Indian masses, represented by the Gadr Party, the Terrorists and other small groups, but it was only with the deepening of exploitation in the years after 1914 that it developed into a mass movement. The same is true of Ireland, of Egypt and in general of the whole colonial world. The colonial world became a blazing hearth of revolt, with the development of the general crisis of capitailsm, one of the fundamental and important spheres of which is the liberation movement in the colonies. It was these colonial revolts which, in 1920 and 1921, were factors of tremendous importance in compelling all-powerful British imperialism to conclude a trade agreement with the R.S.F.S.R. on the one hand, and on the other to submit to the demands of its American rival (naval equality; cancellation of the Anglo-Japanese Treaty; payment of the American Debt, etc.). In the years that followed, the Chinese revolution raised the spectre of Communism in Hong Kong and Singapore and led to new ferocities, new repressions in all the Far Eastern parts of the Empire. In Polynesia, the mass strikes in Fiji were followed by the still unsubdued movement of the Mau in New Zealand's mandated territory of Samoa. Right throughout Africa, from north to south, and from east to west, now in one colony and now in another, the flames of colonial revolt have burst forth.

In East Africa (Kenya) the first attempt to organize a trade union was met by the imprisonment of its leader, Harry Thuku, while in the "model" colony of West Africa (Nigeria) forty-four women were massacred under the second Labor Government for refusal to pay taxes. In the Middle East the mandates held by Britain as a "sacred trust of civilization" failed to meet with the grateful acceptance of the masses of Arabistan. Even the Mediterranean colonies, Cyprus and Malta, were affected by the colonial revolution. It seemed as though British imperialist exploitation had been planted on volcanos that were not extinct but only slumbering and now beginning to erupt.

Every possible maneuver has been resorted to by British imperialism, in order by fraud and force to quell the colonial revolts. But every step taken, every move made by the ever-extending trusts and combines to squeeze the ruined peasantry of the British Empire still further, results only in a still more formidable accumulation of volcanic forces underground. This time as the British imperialists prepare for war they must take into their reckoning, as they did not have to do before 1914, that the outbreak of a new world war may detonate the colonial volcano. Moreover, the influence of its rivals, of the U.S.A. in Latin America, of Italy in the Near East, of Japan in the Far East, is much stronger and more penetrating than before 1914.

INDIA

But the problem of problems of British imperialism is India, with its 350,000,000 population, well-nigh a sixth of mankind. For over one hundred and fifty years the British capitalist system has grown up with India as its colony, sucking the life blood out of India. British imperialism has retarded the development of the natural resources of India, destroyed its manufactures, kept hundreds of millions in poverty and suffering under conditions that have in two generations reduced the expectation of life in India from thirty years to twenty-three years. Exery movement of the Indian people for liberation has been met with unparalleled ferocity, rising to a climax with the British Labor Government's bombing of villages, burnings, floggings and imprisonments of sixty thousand political prisoners. In the Burmese war of liberation in 1932-3, the British put a price on the heads of the "rebel" leaders and gave them no quarter.

But an agrarian revolution advances with the inevitablity of a natural process. Now that consciousness is spreading amongst the peasantry; now that the workers themselves are becoming more and more class conscious, and advancing to the leadership of the whole movement for national emancipation, British imperialism is seeking to make a bargain with the

capitalists of the Indian National Congress in order to maintain and strengthen their dictatorship over the toiling millions. The Indian White Paper, as the "Proposals for Indian Constitutional Reforms" is called, will actually strengthen the feudal-imperialist regime in India under the pretense of granting a Constitution.

In particular, all control of the armed forces will be despotically administered by the British Viceroy. For India, "the brightest jewel in the English Crown", is not only to be guarded against a rising of the masses, but is also likely itself to be a central strategical focus in the new world war.

> "For unthinkable ages", wrote Karl Marx, eighty years ago, "there have been in Asia only three departments of Governments—that of Finance, or plunder of the Interior; that of War, or plunder of the Exterior; and finally that of Public Works. . . . The British in India have taken over from their predecessors the departments of Finance and War, but they have entirely neglected that of Public Works."

The two departments of war and finance form a single problem for British imperialism on the eve of the second world war. Political-economic problems affect strategy, and strategy creates new political-economic problems. The Simon Commission, in its Report published in 1930, was compelled to admit that the current expenditure on arms of the British Government in India was over three-fifths of the total expenditure, "a higher proportion, in fact, than in any other country in the world". Fifteen years after the outbreak of war, when armament expenditure in Great Britain had increased by half, in India it had gone up by one hundred per cent. For over two generations the frontiers of India had been steadily extended; buffer states have been created beyond the frontiers, and as these buffer states have been subjugated new buffer states have been created beyond them again.

The external strategy of making India "safe for British imperialism" begins with its protection by sea and the protection of the air and sea routes thereto. The center of the eastern marine protection is at Singapore in the Straits Settlements, where the construction of the great new naval base has occupied all the post-war years. Here a hostile fleet coming from the east is to be stopped. But since the Dutch East Indies lie within the sphere of British Malaya, the Dutch colonies must also be protected. Much to the chagrin of Japanese imperialism, as expressed in June by the Asahi, the arrangements for the protection of Dutch Indonesia have been carried further forward by the visit of Field-Marshall Lord Allenby and the Conference of Admirals at Singapore.

But the fortifications extend still further. A new Hadrian's Wall is being built along the air route that runs down from Burma and Eastern Bengal through the Federated Malay States, down through Java and Sumatra and Portuguese Timor right to North Australia. Nor is there any fear that these junior allied imperialisms can be broken away from British imperalism. Holland and Britain are strongly linked together by a thousand ties, including the enormous Royal Dutch-Shell Oil Trust, headed by the open enemy and opponent of Bolshevism, Sir Henry Deterding, and the Great Unilever Trust, which plunders Equatorial Africa for the joint benefit of British and Dutch share-holders. As for Portugal, it is within the pocket of the British Empire these last two hundred years. Therefore British imperialism is safe as far as its capitalist junior partners are concerned. But here the strategic problem is involved with the possibility of social revolution, for the Indonesian revolt of 1926 was echoed again in the heroic mutiny of the sailors of the De Zeven Provincien, when European and Mayalan sailors fought together for the first time in history.

On the western sea-route, Britain holds the Suez Canal, has turned the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf into British Lakes, has constructed the air and motor routes from Egypt and Palestine across the Desert of Basra, and has made colonies, mandates or feuditories of all the hinterlands to these routes. So thus "independent" Iraq serves at once as a buffer state and an air base for war upon the Soviet Union, while if in Southwest Arabia the Eman Yahia of the Yemen becomes too friendly with Italian imperialism, the British feuditory, Ibn Saud, brings him to heel in the war that was concluded last month.

But the strategic problems of British imperialism on the land frontiers are much greater than before 1914. Siam, bordering on Burma, has been subjected more and more to Japanese influence, while all round the north, northwestern and northeastern frontiers, the Tsarist empire and the Chinese empire have been transformed by revolution. The radiations of revolution cross the most impassable mountain barriers. The moment the hour of revolution struck. British imperialism began to prepare for the defeat of that revolution from India as a base lest they themselves be defeated inside India by the revolutionary movement of the masses. Thus British imperialism, whilst consolidating its influence in South China and ceaselessly patrolling with its warships the Yang-tze-Kiang River, began in 1925 to establish a new frontier on the Chinese borders of Burma as a stage to the occupation of the districts in Yunnan and Szechwan. Only last December Pan Hung, the rich mining district of

Yunnan, was invaded by two thousand British troops. In proportion as the Chinese Soviets take root and grow, British imperialism advances from the west. Twenty-two years ago, when the Manchu Dynasty was overthrown, Lenin, in his article "Backward Europe and Advanced Asia", called attention to the way in which British imperialism proceeded at once to extend its influence in Tibet as a step in the partition of China. Since then the penetration of Tibet has gone steadily forward, until now the strategy of British imperialism, expressing its counter-revolutionary political aims, is to advance into Sin-Kiang (Chinese Turkestan) where it can threaten the flank of the Middle-Asian Soviet Republics.

For what the British imperialists term "the strategic defence of India" actually means the partition of China, imperialist war against the Chinese Soviets and imperialist war against the U.S.S.R. The advance to war in these regions is prepared by all sorts of "scientific expeditions", mountaineering and orographical, aeronautic and archeological, anthropological, philological and "humanitarian" expeditions.

But each such advance extending the area of exploitation extends also the arena of the colonial revolution against British imperialism in the East Indies and the Middle East.

Therefore, British imperialism, in attempting to solve by political strategic preparations for war the new problem of the colonial revolution, only creates further extensions and intensifications of that problem.

* * *

British imperialism is making preparations for war again, as was done before 1914. This time it faces a new round of problems. First, in the Dominions, and second, and more important, in the colonies. The two problems are bound together in that British imperialism endeavors to make out of the "White Empire" a garrison to hold down the "Colored Empire". Feverishly, measure after measure is being taken to meet the contradictions that are rending and tearing within British imperialism. Allies are being sought and found among the feudal classes, amongst the National Reformists, and everywhere in the parties of social-democracy. An Empire fascism, with oppression multiplied upon oppression, is being built up in Britain, in the Dominions, and in the colonies. British agriculture, by tariffs and quotas, is being placed upon a war footing. Two years ago, the Ottawa Empire Conference was held —a war preparations conference, whose immediate results were increased hostile relations with the United States of America on the one hand and the Soviet Union on the other.

But above all, in relation to the colonies, British imperialism depends on the support of social-democracy. Whereas, before the war of 1914, social-democracy in *words* was against war, only to betray the working class movement when war broke out; this time social-democracy has helped to prepare the war. The General Council of the Trade Union Congress is at present elaborating the formula with which they will assure British imperialism of the support of social-democracy *before* the war breaks out. But deeds are still more important than words. Therefore the calculations of British imperialism for overcoming its problems by the help of social-democracy are based on the bloodthirsty practice of the Labor Government in its treatment of the colonies, in its brutal repression in India, Palestine, and throughout the world.

But there is one factor which can upset these calculations. That is the growth of the consciousness amongst British workers that "no nation which oppresses another nation can itself be free"; that the class struggle at home is bound up with the class struggle in the colonies and that it is a common struggle of the British workers and the colonial masses against a common enemy.

IMPERIALIST CONTRADICTIONS IN THE PACIFIC AND THE ARMAMENTS DRIVE

By IVANOV

THE Pacific Ocean problem is one of the main key questions of world politics. The interests and the strivings of the most powerful imperialist States interweave and come into conflict in the Pacific Ocean. In the Pacific Ocean and in the districts surrounding it there are to be found the most important colonial possessions of the British Empire, as well as of France and the U.S.A. As regards Japanese imperialism, all the lines of its policy of plunder lie in the Pacific Ocean, in different sectors of which its aggression is showing itself to an ever growing degree.

At this stage of history the most important sector of the Pacific is undoubtedly China. The struggle of the imperialist powers for the gigantic Chinese market, for "spheres of influence" in definite regions in the country, or for their open seizure grows ever sharper. On the other hand a rise is taking place in the opposition of the national liberation movement of the Chinese toiling masses against the imperialist robbers. The existence of Soviet regions in China, which are growing firm on their feet, is a guarantee that in the future the Chinese proletariat and peasantry, who have set out on the path to liberation from the yoke of foreign imperialism and from the bondage of the "national" bourgeoisie and landowners, will withdraw China from the position of passive "object" of Pacific politics.

For the Soviet Union with its extensive sea and land borders in the Pacific Ocean and in the Far East, the Pacific Ocean problem is of tremendous political importance and is closely linked up with vital interests and defense.

Imperialist Japan, which is carrying through its robber policy on Chinese territory, at the same time receiving the unequivocal support of British imperialism, is carrying out intense preparations for an attack on the Soviet Union. All this makes it essential and extremely important to carefully take note of all the alterations in the situation in the Pacific Ocean, of the development of the inter-imperialist contradictions, and especially of the strategic situation and the direct preparation of the imperialist states for war in the Pacific Ocean.

The events of the recent period are a warning of the existence of an unheard of sharpening of contradictions and the growth of the war danger. The declaration of the Japanese Minister of Foreign Affairs, made in April of this year, in spite of his "pacific" explanations made later, means nothing other than the official claim of Japanese imperialism for a protectorate over the *whole* of China. In spite of the Washington Nine-Power Agreement concluded in 1921, the participants of which pledged themselves to maintain the principle of the "open door" in China, Japan now lays claim to control over both the political and economic relations of China with foreign states, under the pretext that Japan has a "mission" to "protect the sea" in the Far East. In this way Japanese imperialism is striving to ensure itself a monopoly for further seizures of territory in China, and at the same time to sever all contacts between the latter and other states. What is especially undesirable in the eyes of Tokyo is the present, it is true for the time being only limited, supply of finances to China by America, and the proposed setting up of aviation and air routes in China with American aid. In the same way Japan is placing its "veto" in advance on the comparatively humble plans of financial aid to the Nanking Government proposed by the League of Nations. The recent incident in connection with the "Disappearance of Curamoto" shows that the robber plans of Japan are by no means limited to the Northern regions of China but that they also cover other regions in the country as well.

While carrying through its policy of plunder in China and its preparations for war on the Soviet Union, Japan is intensifying its armaments on land, sea and in the air, at a frantic pace.

In reply to Japanese aggression in the Far East, the U.S.A. is just as hurriedly intensifying its armaments, and is adopting a new program of military, naval, and aviation construction.

Great Britain is also adopting "preventive" measures in connection with all possible opponents.

Thus the situation in the Pacific Ocean is becoming more complicated and is growing ever sharper. At the present time it is sharply different from that which was temporarily organized in the period of the relative stabilization of capitalism, and which found its expression in the Washington Agreement which has now been in fact reduced to nothing.

* * *

The offensive of Japanese imperialism on the continent of Asia, the seizure of Manchuria and

parts of Mongolia, the invasion of the northern provinces of Inner China, the open pretensions to a protectorate over the whole of China and the feverish preparations for new wars of plunder have intensified imperialist contradictions on the Pacific to an unprecedented degree. The aggression of Japanese imperialism hits at the interests of the United States, and for the latter signifies a threat to close the Chinese market. Simultaneously the strengthening of Japan's armaments also creates a direct danger for the colonial possessions of the United States in the Far East, namely, the Philippines and Guam. Though the United States cannot at present prevent the offensive of militant Japan by armed force, it nevertheless announces its non-recognition of the situation which has arisen in Manchuria and Mongolia as a result of Japanese seizures, and simultaneously takes the path of intensively strengthening its armaments. At the same time the interests of British capital are suffering from the increase of Japanese dumping on the world markets. However, to the extent that Great Britain on the one hand encourages the aggressive and militant plans of Japan insofar as they are directed against the Soviet Union, and as on the other hand important contradictions exist between Great Britain and U.S.A. in connection with the struggle of the two biggest imperialist powers for world hegemony, there is no possibility of a united anti-Japanese front being formed by Great Britain and U.S.A. While not hindering Japenese expansion to the North, but, on the contrary, openly inciting Japan to war against the Soviet Union, and taking a lenient attitude to violations of the principle of the Open Door in China by Japanese imperialism, since this strikes above all at the interests of the U.S.A., Great Britain is at the same time taking energetic "precautionary" measures in case Japanese expansion on the Pacific touches British colonial possessions in the southern part of the Pacific basin. The hurried completion of the construction of the Singapore Naval Base and the measures which are planned for strengthening British naval combinations in the Pacific are connected with this.

The situation is bound to become still more tense and complex in the year 1935 in connection with the fact that on the one hand the resignation of Japan from the League of Nations comes into force in that year, and on the other hand a new Naval Conference has to be called then. The former signifies that in respect to the group of islands in the northern part of the Pacific Ocean (the Marian, Caroline and Marshal Islands), which formerly belonged to Germany and were seized by Japan during the World War, the "mandate" given to Japan by the League of Nations ceases to hold force. In spite of the "delicate" situation which thus arises, Japanese imperialism states in advance that it has a fixed determination to keep its hold on these islands, which are important strategic positions in the Pacific, irrespective of any future decision of the League of Nations on this question.

At the Naval Conference, the Washington and London Treaties on the limitation of naval armaments will have to be reviewed. The fact that at the present time the political basis of these treaties has fallen through (they were based on the Treaty of Nine Powers in respect to China which was concluded at the time at the Washington Conference, and which has in practice been torn to shreds by Japanese bayonets), makes it extremely unlikely that the Naval Agreements can be renewed. In addition, such great changes have taken place in the relationship of the naval forces of the imperialist powers in connection with the intensification of their contradictions and the armament race, that the establishment of any proportion and limitation whatever is impossible at the present time. The relation between the naval forces of Great Britain, the U.S.A. and Japan were fixed on the one hand by the Washington Naval Treaty of Feb. 6, 1922, and on the other hand by the London Naval Treaty of April 22, 1930. The Washington Treaty fixed the proportion 5:5:3 for the navies of these three powers in respect to the number and tonnage of the battleships and also in respect to the tonnage of the airplane carriers. The London Treaty also fixed a definite tonnage quota for various categories of lighter vessels, such as cruisers, torpedo boats and submarines. The corresponding "treaty" quotas for all classes of ships of the three powers can be seen from the following table:

	British Empire		U. S. A.		Japan	
	No.	Tonnage	No.	Tonnage	No.	Tonnage
Battleships	15	473,650	15	455,400	9	272,000
Airplane Carriers..	—	135,000	—	135,000	—	81,000
Cruisers "A" (with 8-in. guns)	15	146,800	18	180,000	12	108,400
Cruisers "B" (with 6-in. guns)	—	192,200	—	143,500	—	100,450
Torpedo Boats ...	—	150,000	—	150,000	—	105,500
Submarines	—	52,700	—	52,700	—	52,700

The above-mentioned figures are the limits which must not be exceeded by the time the period of both naval treaties lapses, *i.e.*, by December 31, 1936. However, in reality matters are somewhat different. On the one hand, all the three powers have a considerable tonnage of vessels in the various categories of ships which exceed the "age limits" fixed by the treaties, at the expiration of which they may be replaced by new units. On the other hand, these three powers have by no means equally utilized the possibilities for new construction given to them under the treaties. Whereas Japan has completely utilized

to the limit the new construction quotas provided under the treaties, and in practice has even exceeded them, Great Britain up to the present time has not fully utilized these limits in respect to torpedo boats and submarines, and the U.S.A. also in respect to cruisers. The actual composition of the navies of the three powers at the present time can be seen from the following table. We do not include in it the battleships the construction of which was stopped as far as Great Britain, U.S.A. and Japan were concerned, in accordance with the London Treaty up to December 31, 1936, owing to which the number and tonnage of all three navies correspond exactly to the above figures which represent the quotas fixed.

COMPOSITION OF NAVIES ON DECEMBER 31, 1933 *

	Great Britain		U. S. A.		Japan	
	No.	Tonnage	No.	Tonnage	No.	Tonnage
Airplane Carriers	6	115,350	3	77,500	4	68,370
			[1]	[11,500]		
Cruisers "A"	19	183,686	11	100,000	14	123,520
			[1]	[7,350]	[2]	[15,720]
Cruisers "B"	35	165,045	10	70,500	20	93,375
	[15]	[62,265]			[3]	[21,920]
Torpedo Boats	160	181,864	251	267,470	104	128,802
	[116]	[123,490]	[248]	[263,900]	[42]	[39,821]
Submarines	58	54,744	82	67,790	70	77,125
	[25]	[13,895]	[37]	[21,260]	[7]	[5,344]

* The figures in brackets signify the ships which have passed the age limit and can be replaced by new units.

It can be seen from these figures that the actual relation of the number of ships in the three navies by no means corresponds to the official Washington proportions. In particular, the Japanese navy is at least equal to the American navy in respect to airplane carriers and is considerably *stronger* than it is in respect to both types of cruisers, and especially in respect to the light cruisers with 6-inch guns. As far as concerns torpedo boats and submarines, if we reckon the superannuated units, the Japanese navy occupies respectively the third and second places. But in respect to the number and tonnage of the newest units of both categories (with the exception of the vessels which have passed the age limit), it occupies *first* place at the present time. In particular, this serves as an excuse for the Japanese imperialists to demand equality for its navy with the British and American navies at the forthcoming naval conference in 1935. Japan has backed up this claim not by words but by deeds, and during the last few years has developed such a frantic speed in naval construction that it has completely finished the construction of the London quotas, while its rivals have still a considerable amount of unused tonnage which they can build to reach their quotas.

	Vessels in construction on December, 31, 1933.		*Vessels which can be laid down to reach the London limits in 1934, 1935 and 1936.*	
Airplane Carriers				
	No.	Tonnage	No.	Tonnage
Great Britain	—	—	2	34,100
U.S.A.	3	53,800	1	15,200
Japan	2	20,100	—	—
Cruisers "A"				
Great Britain	—	—	—	—
U.S.A.	7	70,000	1	10,000
Japan	—	—	—	—
Cruisers "B"				
Great Britain	11	75,400	12	87,530
U.S.A.	4	40,000	5	47,100
Japan	6	51,000	—	—
Torpedo Boats				
Great Britain	27	37,275	39	63,696
U.S.A.	32	50,800	65	99,200
Japan	24	33,072	—	—
Submarines				
Great Britain	9	11,140	8	9,362*
U.S.A.	6	7,460	30	35,520
Japan	15	19,200*	—	—

The United States, which had considerably "lagged behind" in the sphere of naval construction, is now, in connection with the intensification of Far Eastern contradictions, hastening to raise the strength of its navy to the limits fixed by the Washington and London treaties. The Winson Bill, which was adopted by the American Congress and endorsed by President Roosevelt on March 27, 1934, gives the government corresponding powers. The American naval budget for 1934-35 provides for the laying down of one cruiser of 10,000 tons with 8-inch guns (the last unit of this class which America has the right to build according to the London treaty), 3 cruisers of 10,000 tons with 6-inch guns (again completing the quota given to America in the London treaty); and in excess of this, from special appropriations (from the funds of the National Industrial Recovery Administration) a further 2 destroyers, 12 torpedo boats and 6 submarines are to be laid down in 1934-5. Although this construction does not go beyond the bounds of the London Treaty, it serves as an excuse for Japanese imperialism to raise the question of increasing the tonnage limit permitted to her. The first and second programs for "reinforcing the navy" adopted by Japan in 1930 and 1933 respectively mean in reality a considerable excess over the London limits. The Japanese press, however, points to American

* The right to "replace" the corresponding tonnage ahead of time was legalized by the London Treaty. In reality, Japan has far exceeded the London quota in this category.

armament and is already carrying on a campaign obviously inspired by the naval general staff for the further strengthening of the navy. The adoption and fulfilment of a new naval construction program in Japan is therefore a foregone conclusion in the very near future. In connection with this, according to reliable information, the Japanese government intends to annul the Washington and London Treaties. Until such a decision is made, Japan is not only fulfiling the London limits but is also carrying on energetic construction work on the categories which were not limited under the London Treaty. The construction program in these categories which has been begun recently provides for the construction of three big aviation transports, two oil tankers, one floating workshop, one submarine base, four submarine destroyers, one minelayer and 16 torpedo boats. Under the pretext that it is a necessity to build a navy for the "independent" state of Manchukuo which it has set up, Japan is also carrying on construction in excess of the London limits.

Great Britain does not lag behind its rivals in the speed at which it is strengthening its navy. The British admiralty points to their intensive arming, to the present "weakness" of the British navy, and to the necessity of "guarding" the sea communications of the British empire, and is preparing a new ship-building program. In the 1934-35 financial year three 9,000-ton cruisers, one 5,200-ton cruiser, 9 destroyers and torpedo boats and 3 submarines will be laid down. In the future, as the leading organs of the British press unequivocably make plain, naval construction will be considerably speeded-up and financial allocations for naval construction will be increased. The increase in the naval budgets of the three Pacific powers in connection with the sharpening of their contradictions during the last few years present a very clear picture:

	Gt. Britain (*million pounds*)	*U.S.A.* (*million dol.*)	*Japan* (*million yen*)
1931-32	50,015,000	357,821,000	227,128,000
1932-33	50,164,000	349,562,000	306,766,000
1933-34	53,570,000	332,000,000	403,771,000
1934-35	56,650,000	457,000,000	487,871,000

The rivalry in the sphere of naval armaments is not limited to the ships that constitute the navies, but extends to naval aviation. Simultaneously with fulfilling its two programs for "reinforcing the navy", Japan is trebling the strength of its naval aviation, increasing it from 14 squadrons in 1930 to 39. The U.S.A. has not restricted itself to the fulfilment of its 1926 program which fixed the strength of naval aviation at 1,000 planes (a figure which is several times as large as the naval forces of any other power), and is beginning to carry out a new program of airplane construction at the present time which, by the time the navy is increased to treaty limits (according to the Vinson Bill), is to increase the strength of its naval aviation forces to 2,184 planes. Finally, Great Britain is also taking energetic steps to strengthen its air forces.

But the praparations for war are by no means limited to these increases in the naval and air forces.

In order to get a clear idea of the relationship of the naval forces of the future opponents on the Pacific Ocean, we must not only take account of the number of vessels in their navies, but also their systems of naval bases and the possibility they have of operations in the probable theatre of war. The dangerous task facing the Japanese navy in time of war is to ensure communications between Japan and the Asiatic continent. This will provide Japanese imperialism with sources of raw material and food, and also the possibility of maintaining and further extending its territorial conquests at the expense of China. The preparations for war against the Soviet Union and the very conduct of this war will also be impossible unless sea communications are ensured across the narrow seas dividing Japan from the Asiatic continent (Sea of Okhotsk, Sea of Japan, Chinese Sea and Yellow Sea).

On the other hand, in case of war with America, the Japanese naval forces would also have the duty of conducting active operations against the American island possessions in the Pacific, namely the Philippines and Guam and also, possibly, cruiser operations along the shore of Alaska and the U.S.A. itself. The position of Japan in the western part of the Pacific basin is secured by a rectangle of powerful naval bases on the chief Japanese islands (Yokosuka, Sasebojur and Maidsuru) and also auxiliary bases (Tokuyama, Bako) in the Piscador Islands, Ominato, Rio-Yon (Port Arthur). All these bases are intended to guarantee the communications of Japan with its colonial possessions and with the districts which it has seized on Chinese territory. Simultaneously they provide the Japanese navy with the possibility of operating in any direction in the western part of the Pacific basin.

As advanced bases for light forces and aviation, use will be made of the group of islands seized by Japan in the Pacific as a result of the World War (the Marian, Caroline and Marshall Islands which formerly belonged to Germany). The Marian Islands, and the Bonin Islands which formerly belonged to Japan, and the Pelew Islands which stretch out in a meridianal direction, cut across the communications of the U.S.A. with the ports of China. Other groups of islands, particularly the Caroline and Marshall Islands, which stretch parallel to the equator, hang over the flank of these communications. In case of war, the cutting off of America's communications both with the Asiatic continent and with its own island possessions in the

western part of the Pacific Ocean, namely the Philippine Islands and Guam and the capture of the latter, form one of the chief tasks for the Japanese navy.

Active operations by its main forces in the eastern part of the Pacific Ocean are made difficult by the absence of naval bases there. However, this by no means excludes the operations of Japanese light cruisers and submarines (which, it may be remarked, have an enormous radius of action) against American ocean trade between the Pacific ports and against the Panama Canal. Although the Washington Treaty prohibits the construction of fortifications or the formation of naval bases on the above-mentioned islands belonging to Japan, the latter nevertheless is actively constructing bases for its navy and aviation forces both on the Bonin Islands and on the Pelew Islands and on various islands of the Marian and Caroline groups. Sufficient information is available regarding the establishment of coastal batteries and the setting up of airdromes on the islands of Hosol, Malakai and Saipan (in the Marian Island group). Thus Japan is actively making preparations for the future naval theatre of war for the operations of its navy.

As for the U.S.A., its position in the Pacific Ocean is still weak in respect to naval bases up to the present time. This weakness comprises one of the "weak" spots in the policy and strategy of American imperialism. It prevents the latter from putting pressure on its rivals and establishing such an influence on the course of Pacific and Far Eastern politics as corresponds to its enormous economic resources, and consequently to its potential military power. At the present the American navy possesses only one operative base in the Pacific Ocean, namely Pearl Harbor in the Hawaii Islands. This base is situated at a distance of 2,089 sea miles from San Francisco (the rear base of the American naval forces in the Pacific Ocean in case of war) and a distance of 4,770 sea miles from Cavite Bay in the Philippine Islands. Moreover, the radius of action of the main forces of the navy (particularly the battleships) is reckoned at approximately 500 miles only. Thus there can be no talk of the American navy defending the Philippines and Guam, and also of its active operations against the Japanese navy and the Japanese island possessions in the western part of the Pacific Ocean, in the event of war between U.S.A. and Japan, singly and without allies.

The United States is trying to compensate for its "weak spots" which make active operations difficult for its navy, by intensifying the development of naval aviation. The American air forces and also the submarines might carry on active operations against Japan, by basing them on Alaska and the Aleutian Islands to the west of it. Until recently, the U.S.A. had no naval base in this part of the Pacific Ocean and no points of reserve. At the present time bases are being equipped for air operations and for the light forces of the navy in Deutsch Harbor in Alaska. Simultaneously, preliminary investigations are being made in the Aleutian Islands with a view to forming advanced bases in these islands for air forces and submarine flotillas. The fortification of the islands is formally prohibited by the Washington treaty; but in connection with its probable annulment and the intensification of naval rivalry (particularly American-Japanese contradictions), the corresponding measures will be one of the most urgent and practical tasks of American naval policy in the near future.

The rapid progress of aviation, especially the increase in the radius of action of bombing planes, considerably reduces the advantage Japan had in the fact of the vast spaces of the Pacific Ocean. The possibility of the use of aviation by America in case of a Japanese-American war is thus increasing. But at the present day, the possibility of active operations against Japan, by the sea and air forces of the U.S.A. is still very limited and difficult. Owing to this, the most insistent task facing the U.S.A., in proportion as Japanese aggression sharpens and deepens, is to find allies. The repeated attempts made by the U.S.A. to come to terms with Great Britain during the present Far Eastern events, with a view to ensuring the possibility of the U.S.A. using the British naval bases in the western part of the Pacific Ocean, have always resulted in failure. The causes of this are the growing and deepening contradictions of both of these big capitalist powers in the struggle for world hegemony. Another possible way to overcome the basic difficulties which face American strategy in the Pacific Ocean is to establish contacts with the countries of the Asiatic continent which suffer from Japanese aggression.

Great Britain, with its powerful system of naval bases in the Pacific Ocean, could play a decisive role on one side or the other if it should intervene in the course of a Japanese-American conflict. In reality, the Singapore naval base, the equipment of which is being completed at the present time and will be finished in 1935, renders it possible to transfer the main forces of the British navy from the Mediterranean, and, if necessary, from British home waters, to the Far East. At the present time the Singapore base has powerful harbor equipment and repair yards. In particular, the biggest floating dock in the world, capable of accommodating vessels of up to 50,000 tons, has already been built there, and construction is being completed on a double dry dock which is also able to accommodate the biggest ships. There are five double docks for cruisers. In addition large fuel reservoirs have been established in the Singapore naval base. In connection with the increase of the strength of the British air forces at Singapore, a big air base is now being constructed

there in addition to the naval base. At the same time the system of fortifications is being strengthened, particularly the coastal batteries which protect the entrance to Singapore, on which long range artillery of the largest caliber—up to 18 inches—has been mounted. Singapore closes the passage from the Pacific Ocean to the Indian Ocean and provides the British naval forces with facilities for the defense of Ceylon, India and also, though not in full, owing to the great distance, of Australia and New Zealand. At the same time, it will be difficult to use it as a base for active operations by the main forces of the British navy against the American island possessions in the Pacific Ocean, on the one hand, and against Japan on the other hand. It is situated at a distance of 1,260 sea miles from Manilla, in the Philippines, and 1,640 miles from Formosa. However, the advanced base for the British navy in the Far East can be Hong Kong (which has eight dry docks and is protected by strong coast batteries). Hong Kong is only 360 miles from Formosa and 600 miles from Manilla. At the present itme it serves as a base for big concentrations of British light forces (cruisers and submarines). In connection with the equipment and forthcoming opening of the Singapore base, which is intended to be the basic operative base of the British naval forces in the Pacific Ocean, the significance of Hong Kong will rapidly increase.

In this connection, new importance is assumed by the base which is now being equipped for the light forces and aviation in Port Darwin, on the northwest coast of Australia, the old base in Sydney (Australia), and the base in Auckland (New Zealand), as links in the single system of British naval bases on the Pacific Ocean.

Thus, in making practical preparations for war on the Pacific, Great Britain, like the other two Pacific imperialist powers, is not, however, showing at the same time any intention to put its naval forces at the disposal of any of these powers. There is reason to think that in the forthcoming bloody drama in the Pacific British imperialism intends to play the role of the "happy third", and will refrain from interference in the initial phase of the future conflict so as to act at the moment when the forces of the opponents are weakened by the struggle.

Great importance attaches to the struggle which is taking place at the present time in Central and Southern China between the imperialist powers, in respect to the setting up of air lines and air bases on its territory. Having seized Manchuria and preparing to seize the northern provinces of China, which it already controls in a military sense, Japan is fiercely opposing the attempts of the U.S.A. to form air bases in those districts of China on which it has not yet been able to lay its hands. It well realizes that if the U.S.A. sets up bases for its aviation on Chinese territory, this would wipe out the distance factor which is so favorable for Japan, and there would arise a direct menace of air raids on its centers and naval bases from the side of the Asiatic continent.

The race for naval armaments on the part of the Pacific powers determines in advance their irreconcilable contradictions at the forthcoming new naval conference and the inevitable collapse of the later.

The London conversations which took place in May and June between representatives of Great Britain, U.S.A., and Japan have not led to any preliminary agreement whatsoever, not only with regard to the fundamental questions facing the Conference, but also regarding procedure, the exact date for calling the Conference and as to who should participate in it. Particularly as regards the latter point the question has arisen of inviting to the Conference not only the five states which participated in the Washington and London Naval Agreements, but also the U.S.S.R. and Germany. The political problems linked up with the Far East have, mainly on the insistence of Japan, been removed from the program of the preliminary conversations. Japanese imperialism wishes at all costs to prevent a repetition of the Washington Conference, when alongside the Naval Agreement it was compelled under the united pressure of the U.S.A. and Great Britain to make concessions on questions of Far Eastern policy. It wishes to preserve intact the plunder which it has seized at the expense of China, and to preserve for itself unlimited possibilities for further imperialist expansion. The Japanese proposal to the U.S.A., made at the time of the London conversations regarding a pact of non-aggression, is an open manœuver, which by no means implies a lessening of Anglo-American contradictions, but is only calculated to free for the present period of time the hands of Japan in relation to the U.S.S.R. and China. As was to be expected, the proposal was turned down by the U.S.A. Insofar as political questions have been removed from the program of the conversations, the latter for the time being are limited to purely technical military and naval problems. In view of the absence of any kind of political basis, any kind of serious agreement on these questions is completely ruled out.

In reality, the continuation of the Washington and London restrictions for a new period, with the maintainance of the proportions established by these treaties, as is proposed by the U.S.A., will inevitably conflict with the claims of Great Britain, which demands an increase of the quotas given to it at London, especially in the cruiser category, and the claims of Japan which unequivocally demands "parity" with the other two naval powers.

The proposal of Great Britain to reduce the maximum tonnage and calibre of the guns of the vari-

ous categories of the navy, compared with the limits established at Washington (battleships from 35,000 tons and 16 inch guns to 22,000 tons or 25,000 tons and 11 or 12 inch guns, cruisers, from 10,000 tons and 8 inch guns to 7,000 tons and 6 inch guns) will inevitably be resisted by the U.S.A. As already mentioned, the latter is poorly supplied with naval bases and consequently is interested in building ships of the greatest possible size and therefore with the greatest radius of action.

On the other hand, the proposal of Great Britain to abolish submarines, which are so dangerous for British sea commerce, a proposal which is insistently advanced by the British admiralty at all "disarmament" conferences, will inevitably be rejected by Japan and also by France. Both of these powers attach tremendous importance to the maintenance of submarines, since they possess the most numerous and most powerful submarine fleets.

The proposal advanced by Japan to abolish airplane carriers and limit naval aviation (because as far as this new weapon is concerned, Japan is much weaker than the U.S.A., and has reason to fear the further strengthening of America's naval aviation) will inevitably be rejected by its rivals.

In addition to these disputed questions which affect various types of armament and the relation of naval forces, *the problem of naval bases* will inevitably come up at the forthcoming conference in an acute form. The Washington treaty prohibited the construction of new bases, and support points for the navy and aviation, and the establishment of new fortifications within the limits of an extensive zone in the Pacific Ocean including, in respect to Japan, the Kuril, Bonin, Marian, Caroline and Marshall Islands; in respect to the U.S.A.—the Philippines, Guam and the Aleutian Islands, and in respect to Great Britain—Hong Kong and the groups of islands in the southern part of the Pacific Ocean. But in view of the fact that this decision has in reality already been violated by the parties to the Washington treaty, especially by Japanese imperialism, and in view of the fact that it was connected with the maintenance of definite proportions in respect to the number and tonnage of the naval forces of the Pacific powers, there can be no question of keeping it in force at the forthcoming naval conference. This in turn signifies that there are prospects of fierce rivalry not only in the sphere of naval and airplane construction but also in the sphere of the construction of new bases and support points on the Pacific Ocean for naval and air forces, and feverish preparations of this theatre for the coming decisive conflicts.

SOME EXPERIENCES FROM THE ACTIVITY OF THE C. P. OF JAPAN IN THE ARMY

(*From data in the Party Press.*)

TANAGI KATSUO

A tall wooden fence stretches along the street over a whole block. Painted a dull blackish-gray color it reminds one of a prison wall, which cuts off part of the street, festive with green vegetation, the sun, the shop windows, where bright textures show off their colors, where fruit and vegetables form a palette of paints, and where bright parasols spread their fancy wings.

A massive gate is in the center. Two striped sentry-boxes stand near the gate. Two khaki-clad sentries stand at attention under the scorching rays of the sun. From morning till night, broken shots are heard there, and a cacophony of signal horns.

Here are the barracks of the N. regiment stationed in Tokyo. Here, as in thousands of similar other barracks scattered all over Japan, are locked in the best elements of the youth of the nation. Cannon fodder is being prepared out of them, for the war which is now going on, and for the war which is to come.

From the very first days of the war in China the Communist Party of Japan placed its best members in the barracks, on the men-of-war, and at the front. In spite of all obstacles the Party press, and Party leaflets, penetrated into the ranks of the "Emperor's army", bound the workers and peasants clad in khaki to their brothers in the factories and villages with thousands of powerful threads. Since the Manchurian events, the central organ of the Party, the *Sekki*, has become a real anti-war, Bolshevik newspaper. The paper set up a special section for propaganda in the army and navy, which contains letters from soldiers and sailors of the expeditionary units and from garrisons in the rear. In September, 1932, the *Soldier's Friend* (*Neisi no tomo*) appeared in the army. The Party began to issue a special monthly paper for the masses of soldiers. In October, the mass arrests of Communists disrupted the publication of the paper for a time, but it began to appear once more in the beginning of March, 1933. A naval news-

paper, *The Lofty Mast,* began to appear in the military port of Kurs. Local papers were published by Communists in the barracks, men-of-war and ports.

* * *

A recruit ceases to be a human being as soon as the gates of the barracks are locked behind him. He becomes a soldier. Day in and day out, until his unit is sent to the front, he will march on the parade ground until he is dizzy, and to the accompaniment of the howling of non-commissioned officers, he will be taught to shoot, to stab, and to suffocate while wearing a mask during training. Military drill, cruelty and promotion will make an obedient killing automaton out of him.

The *Soldier's Friend* correctly approaches the soldier, who is tormented by his drill, by dealing first and foremost with the things that agitate him. In publishing letters from soldiers and sailors in different units, the newspaper shows how hard is the life of the soldier in the army and in the navy. By arousing a protest from the masses against the barbaric methods employed in military training, against the arbitrariness of the officers, the newspaper shows the way to struggle, namely, by creating soldier's committees.

". . . Lately, in connection with the preparations for the regimental shooting contest, we are daily in our company having strenuous training and shooting matches. We are told that if the company shoots successfully, we will receive a present from the Emperor. This is the usual maneuver of the rascals, to evoke competition between us. This is how they force us to train ourselves in the art of the murdering of men.

"On June 20, while training, 15 soldiers showed very bad marksmanship. As punishment they were ordered to run at full speed in full equipment from Toyamagahar to the barracks. Tired from the day's training, one of the recruits fainted during the race in the street of Sendshey. Half an hour later he was found lying there by the comrades who picked him up. Another of these soldiers lost consciousness and dropped near Seimon. He regained conciousness only in the morning. This refers not only to the soldiers who suffered in this particular case. Similarly cruel barbaric training is applied to all soldiers. Therefore this case is one that affects us all. Many of us are discontented, but we keep silent. After this case, we have begun to feel the necessity of uniting for the purpose of jointly presenting our demands to the officers and the non-commissioned officers. We shall immediately organize a soldiers' committee!

"Soldiers of X Company, Y regiment."

(*Soldier's Friend*, No. 2, March 10, 1933).

On board the men-of-war, the sailors are tormented, in addition to drilling, by the drudgery of "keeping the vessel in order". The *Soldier's Friend* raises this question before the masses of sailors in the following letter:

". . . I believe that such conditions are to be found not only on board our ship, but on the other ships as well. We don't see the light of day because of the work we have to do. This work does not last a day or two; it lasts for months at a stretch, so that the weaker chaps break down. We clean the vessel from rust, and inhale the smell, and paint the vessel in such places where the air is so foul that the candles go out. And after working in one spot for a few hours, we all express our discontent. The question is asked, 'and does the Emperor know how hard our work is? We are only the children of His Majesty when we are fed with bullets. But it is no concern of his when we starve.' We are against war, which destroys workers and peasants! We demand sanitary equipment on board ship! The money spent for the war should be given for unemployment dole! Such is our unanimous opinion. I believe that our brothers on board other ships are just as dissatisfied. If so, then it's no use being silent! We must unite our forces and act jointly. Only then will we succeed in getting our demands satisfied and improve the life of our brothers."

The Japanese militarists devote a great deal of attention to the ideological training of the soldier. The line followed by the barrack "political schooling", which takes up a considerable part of the soldiers' time, is to make a devoted servant of the Emperor and fatherland of the worker or peasant lad, to set him against "domestic and foreign enemies". The soldiers are told over and over again about the divine origin of the dynasty, and about the invincibility of their army and the Emperor. The ideal of loyal faithfulness and self-sacrifice is hammered into them, by quoting many examples from history and from the biographies of various generals. Particular attention is devoted to setting the soldiers against the U.S.S.R. and the Communists. In the very heat of the military activity in Manchuria, there were cases of military games being organized, staging the seizure of Soviet trenches.

The Party is developing a fierce struggle against the monarchist and chauvinist training of the masses of soldiers and sailors. The Party press is organically imbued with the struggle against the monarchy. Both the *Soldier's Friend* and the *Sekki* show many excellent examples of Bolshevik agitation among the soldier masses against the monarchy.

Thus we read in the *Soldier's Friend*:

". . . As we are aware, the essence of the military training in the Japanese army is the blind,

forcible hammering in of monarchist ideas into the heads of the soldiers.

"We are forced to read and to copy 'the August Decree to the Soldiers', which reads: 'We, the Emperor, are your Marshal. You are our faithful servants. You must profoundly revere us, your head,' and so forth. But if all this is true, that the Emperor is our Marshal, and we are his faithful servants, then how is it that the following events can happen? How did the Monarchist government, the militarists, and the police behave, when the street car workers, who are our brothers, recently began a struggle against dismissals, against wage cuts and persecution? What did they do when our fathers and brothers in the villages in the prefectures of Niigate, Yamenasi, Mie, Seitams, Aomori, and Nokkaido rose against the hated landlords for rice, and for land? The Emperor's government is a government which ruthlessly suppresses the struggle of our fathers and brothers against unemployment, exploitation and want. And when we, workers and peasants, clad in military uniform, are told that we must be the first servants of the Emperor, they deceive us! . . ."

In exposing the extraordinary parliamentary session of 1932, as a session for the speeding up of war, the *Soldier's Friend* skilfully makes use of the patriotic hullabaloos raised by the bourgeois press in connection with the news that the court intended to come to the aid of the people, by donating 4,800,000 yen in the course of five years. In this regard the *Soldier's Friend* stated:

". . . 4,800,000 yen appears to be rather a big sum. But let us examine what part of the total funds at the disposal of the Emperor's court this sum represents. This sum is to be spread over five years, which makes it 960,000 yen per annum, whereas the yearly income of the court is 34,500,000 yen. Of this sum, 4,500,000 yen comes out of our taxes. The income from bonds and lands owned by the court amounts to 30,000,000 yen. Thus, even if the Emperor gives 4,800,000 yen, it will be merely one-thirty-sixth of his yearly income. He will give one yen out of every 36 yens of his yearly income. If you divide these 960,000 yen among the 90,000,000 of Japan's population, only 1.1 yen falls to the share of each person. Such a miserable pittance will hardly help anybody. The fraud is quite obvious. The Emperor gives it because he is afraid of the sharpening of the struggle of the workers and peasants inside the country. In Osaka a movement is already developing for the distribution of this money not in five years, but at once and immediately."

The soldier is locked up in the barracks, or hurried to the front, and has almost no contact with his family and his friends. The army is mostly composed of peasants. It is usual for recruits to be sent from one locality to another, farther removed from their home. Contact by post remains. But it is rather difficult for the soldiers to keep up a correspondence on the beggarly pay they receive. They frequently haven't enough for a postage stamp. Furthermore, the officers who take care of the proper moral and political welfare of their units subject both the soldier's letter home, and the letters he receives from home, to a rigid censorship, frequently confiscating them.

The *Soldier's Friend* tells the masses of soldiers the truth about the sufferings and starvation of the soldiers' famiiles, who are without their bread-winners. It cites authentic facts of the wanton ruination of the homesteads, and suicides of the soldiers' relatives, quoting their names and the names of the villages. It gives the soldiers an exposure of the true essence of the extraordinary parliamentary session of 1932, so much advertised by the bourgeois press as a "Session for the Salvation of the People", and claims that the building works undertaken to help the village will in reality bring no actual help to the peasantry. This is what the paper says:

"At first the Government announced that 340,000,000 yen would be assigned under the estimate for the 'relief of the people'. However, 'owing to financial difficulties' the estimate was cut down almost by half, namely to 160,000,000 yen. The estimate of each ministry is the preparation for a big war under cover of relief. According to this 'relief' estimate, 43,000,000 yen are allotted for the improvement of arms, ammunitions and equipment for the army. 43,000,000 yen are assigned for the building and repair of men-of-war. 10,000,000 yen are assigned to the Ministry of Communications for the opening of an air-line between Hokkaido and Formosa. 44,000,000 yen are allotted to the Ministry for Home Affairs for the laying of a special telephone system, etc., etc. All this is called 'relief', but it is as clear as daylight that it is an estimate for war preparations."

The government is advertising building works for the relief of the peasantry, as the basic work to help the population. It says that if one-half of the 75,000,000 yen allotted for this work, *i.e.*, 37,500,000 be spent as wages to the peasants employed on it, then 43,700 peasants will thus be helped. This is an outright lie! Only 315,000 people will be able to get employment. Compare this figure with the 30,000,000 population of starving peasants. Such in reality are these shameless fraudulent figures of "relief"!

The *Sekki* writes systematically about the disastrous position of the peasants, about the way tenants are driven from the land, about the forcible

extortion of taxes, about the confiscation of their crops and the sale of farms by auction in order to extort debts and taxes. The paper explains that the 2.2 billion war budget, the war loans, the driving of the workers in the peasant families to the front doom the peasants to ever more weighty disasters. The paper demands that all tax indebtedness be annulled, that the poor and middle peasants be exempted from taxes, that all the taxes should be extracted from the landlords and the kulaks. The paper demands that the units be recalled from the front, and that the money spent for the war be devoted to assisting the peasants and the unemployed.

The Communists who work in the village in the peasant unions use the opportunity provided by cases of oppression by the landlords of the families of peasants recruited into the army, and cases of land confiscation, etc., to link up the struggle of the tenants with the anti-war struggle. In a number of regions the revolutionary peasant union has succeeded in organizing its anti-war activity so efficiently, that the authorities and the gendarmerie have been forced to restrain the attacks of the landlords on the soldiers' families.

The Communist Party of Japan exposes the class nature of the "Emperor's army", and is fighting for the establishment of an active link between the workers and the soldiers.

From the very first days of the war the Party put forward the following demands: to pay wages in full to workers taken into the army; to include the period of military service in the uninterrupted period of industrial service*; to immediately supply demobilized soldiers with employment on the same terms as before the mobilization; to provide for the families of the soldiers, etc.

These demands of the soldiers were immediately caught up by the masses in the factories, etc. The workers began to put them forward in strikes and conflicts. These demands were particularly widespread at the very height of the war operations in Manchuria and near Shanghai, when many workers were taken into the army from the works and factories. The struggle of the workers striking for the soldiers' interests was one of the forms of rendering the economic struggle political and of interlinking it with the anti-war struggle. On the other hand, the wave of these strikes exerted a great influence upon the army. At the time when the workers of the Tokyo subway went on strike (March, 1932), and set forth the soldiers' demands, under the leadership of the Communists, the soldiers at the front followed the heroic strike and discussed it. It excited a live response among the masses of soldiers. In Tokyo itself, a soldier, who formerly worked in the subway, deserted from the barracks to help the strikers. He came to the strike committee and the workers had great difficulty in persuading him to return to his unit, and not to ruin himself in vain. This case of desertion was taken into consideration in military circles. Both the military and the gendarmerie authorities came out with assurances that they would themselves take care that the employers would not infringe on the interests of the "heroes, fighting at the front".

At the beginning of 1933, the fascist trade unions and the reactionary organizations in the factories started an intense campaign for levies and donations for the "defense of the country", for the construction of tanks and "Patriot" airplanes at the expense of the workers. The Party organized a counter-campaign against war and fascism. In the factories the Communists organized all kinds of workers' meetings, talks, "tea parties", etc. They secured the adoption of proposals to disrupt and boycott the collections, about the raising of wages, about stopping the intensification of labor as a result of war orders. And along with this, they proposed that the funds already collected should be placed under the control of the workers and should be handed over for the relief of the soldiers' families, and to the peasants of the northeastern provinces, who had suffered from the flood, and to the unemployed. Thus, the Party once more introduced the "demands of the soldiers" into the struggle of the workers.

Without confining itself to this, the Party put forward the demand for immediate State assistance at the expense of the war budget, to those in need from the flood. It demanded that the soldiers stationed in China, who were natives of the provinces affected by the catastrophe, should be sent bask home; that the troops and men-of-war sent there to "maintain order" in connection with unrest among the peasants should be withdrawn. This activity of the Party inside the army found its reflection in the ferment that developed among the soldiers who were natives of the provinces affected by the flood.

In the summer of 1933, the Party waged an anti-war campaign in connection with the air-defense maneuvers in the Canton district.

Among the slogans launched during the campaign there were again included slogans concerning the soldiers, such as: medical treatment and rest for the soldiers wounded when in maneuvers, payment of double wages after the maneuvers, relief to soldiers' families at the expense of funds allotted for the maneuvers, compensations for the losses due

* It is a practice in Japanese factories that a lengthy period of industrial employment entitles the workers to a pension "for having worked a certain period of years", and larger benefits in case of dismissal, etc.

to the damages caused to peasant fields, payment for military quarters in the villages, etc.

At the same time, the *Sekki* stressed that the struggle against the air maneuvers presented excellent opportunities for the organization of the united struggle of the workers, peasants and soldiers, and indicated to the Party organizations the forms for rapprochement between the masses and the soldiers, and the forms of joint struggle, such as, for instance, the organization of amusements for the soldiers at the bivouacs, the setting up of committees to estimate the losses caused by the maneuvers to the peasant fields—committees made up of workers, peasants and soldiers.

While struggling for the establishment of a bond between the workers and the army, both the *Sekki* and the *Soldier's Friend* systematically gave publicity to the worsening of the conditions of the workers in the factories, etc., in connection with the war, and the struggle of the workers against this, stressing the necessity for joint struggle. This is how the *Sekki* described the conditions of the workers at the Nakedzime works, which was engaged on urgent war orders:

> "Aviomotors are manufactured here. Only 20 per cent extra is allowed for work the whole night through. The workers are getting thinner, they have lost weight up to 1 kan.
>
> "Last year we were producing from 14 to 15 motors a month, now we are making 50. The officers commissioned to the works speak about the necessity of increasing the monthly output of motors up to 100, for otherwise, they say, we will be unable to win the war. If we continue this way in the future, we will drop off our feet altogether.
>
> "The departments are strictly separated from one another. Communications between the workers employed in the different departments is almost impossible. It is impossible to exchange a few words with your comrades. The ceilings in the department are made of glass, and a supervisor watches from above, who is doing the talking. Gendarmes are permanently present at the works. 'Pinkertons' are in abundance all over the place. We are watched as though we are in a prison.
>
> "At night, the moment the supervisor goes out, the workers talk about their low wages, and their long working hours. In the machine section, the workers began to grasp that the more they worked, the more their piece-work rate was reduced, so they ceased to rush their work. General indignation prevails. The walls of the lavatories are covered with protests. As soon as they are whitewashed, fresh inscriptions make their appearance.". (Oct. 20, 1933.)

An excellent way of linking the workers with the army was the organization of meetings at the factories, etc., on the initiative of the Party, in connection with the homecoming of soldiers on furlough, or of demobilized soldiers who spoke at these meetings and spoke about the war or life at the front. In these cases the soldiers frequently proved to be the best agitators against the war. There were cases when the Communists transformed the parties, organized by the factory owners for the purpose of raising patriotic sentiments among the workers, parties in honor of the "heroes returned from the front",—into anti-war meetings.

> ". . . At one Tokyo works," stated a report in the *Soldier's Friend*, "the management organized a gathering to hear stories about the war. Seventy workers were present. The tale was told by a soldier from the front. He spoke for about two hours about what the soldiers had to suffer at the front. Even there the officers wrapped themselves in several blankets, whereas the tired soldiers were unable to sleep at night, on account of the cold, for one blanket had to be shared by three men. The soldiers were not supplied with warm clothing, while they had to shoot from the knee, or lying in the snow in frosts of 40 degrees below zero (C.). The food was so bad that even pigs would not eat it. The chairman of this meeting finally got scared and closed the gathering. The audience was very much excited and carried a resolution against the war." (March 13, 1933.)

The Party is popularizing the peace policy of the U.S.S.R. among the masses of soldiers and tells them what the Red Army is, how it differs from the Japanese "Emperor's army". For instance, we find in the *Soldier's Friend* of March 10, 1933, a large article headed, "A Day in a Red Army barracks of the U.S.S.R." The paper described this day, from reveille in the morning until "lights out" at night and related how the Red Army man masters military technique, how he improves his cultural standards, how he spends his leisure hours. The paper built its entire story on a contrast between the conditions prevailing in Soviet barracks and those in Japanese barracks. In a description of the political hour, devoted to the question of the possibility of the Japanese troops, who seized Manchuria, attacking the Soviet border, the newspaper inserted the following words into the mouth of a Red Army man:

> ". . . We will have to fight firmly against those who attack our Soviet Union, our workers' and peasants' State, whoever they may be. However, not all are alike in the Japanese army. The majority in that army are Japanese soldiers who do not know for whose sake they came to Manchuria, and what they are fighting for. But there is a real army, who forces these soldiers to fight. This is the Japanese capitalists, the landlords and the monarchist government. The Japanese sol-

diers, like ourselves, are children of the workers and of the peasants. There is no law that the children of the workers and of the peasants should kill each other. And this should be told to our Japanese comrades in the first place.

"Fifteen years ago we annihilated the barbaric power of tsarism, and of the landlords and capitalists, and established a workers' and peasants' power in Russia. For 15 years we have defended this power and for the first time in history have built up a Socialist State. The Japanese comrades must grasp this fact as soon as possible and establish in their country, in Japan, the power of the workers, peasants and soldiers."

The Party and its press are conducting great work in exposing the class nature of the imperial army, making use for this purpose of the facts of the shooting of revolutionary units at the front. For instance, the *Soldier's Friend* reported the following:

"In the beginning of January the soldiers of the N Company of the Himedzi division, stationed in Dziaranton* region, indignant at the delay in demobilization, began to return home arbitrarily, ignoring the orders of their commanders, and infecting other units by their example. The scared commanders of the division immediately surrounded the soldiers in revolt with a detachment which excelled them in numbers and arrested the soldiers who offered resistance. Two hundred men were arrested and shot.

"As one man, these Japanese soldiers showed firm resistance to the end and fell under the bullets of the Japanese imperialists with the revolutionary call: 'Down with the imperialist war!' 'Evacuate the army from China!'" (Oct. 3, 1933.)

The Party removed from the pedestal the legend about the invincibility of the Japanese army by describing the defeats it suffered from the Chinese troops.

"Isimoto, a spy of the Quantung army, was captured by the Chinese volunteer army in Jehol. Some time later, the Japanese commanders occupied this province under the pretext of releasing Isimoto. The volunteer army in Jehol valiantly resisted the Japanese invasion. On August 19, a detachment of 300 men destroyed the railway line in the vicinity of Nanrio, and attacked the headquarters of Yosioke, who was marching to the assistance of Isimoto. On August 20 a new battle took place which lasted several hours, the Japanese troops suffered a great loss, many being killed and wounded. Such is the stubborn resistance being offered to the invasion of Japanese imperialism into 'Inner Mogolia'." (*Soldier's Friend*, Oct. 3, 1933.)

In explaining to the masses of soldiers that the "Manchurian bandits" whom the bourgeois press slanders and whom the Japanese commanders vainly endeavor to liquidate, are Chinese peasants, who defend their country from Japanese seizure with arms in their hands, the *Soldier's Friend* shows with facts and figures how the poorly armed Chinese partisans, sometimes only possessing shotguns, defeat the Japanese troops, who excel them in numbers and in arms, and compel them to retreat. For instance:

"The armed workers and peasants, who are waging a stubborn struggle against the occupation of Manchuria by the Japanese troops and against the puppet Manchurian state, are organizing partisan detachments and are developing a movement throughout the whole of Manchuria.

"From August 1 to 20—a period of 20 days—the partisans made 68 attacks on the South Manchurian Railway line and on August 21 they destroyed the railway bridge on the Kodzen river. A partisan detachment of 1,000 men attacked Eihan and destroyed the whole of the enemy's forces. On August 28, the partisans raided Mukden. They seized airplanes, set fire to warehouses and airplanes, and disarmed a police detachment. In the morning of the 29th, a bitter fight followed, with the Japanese-Manchurian troops. On September 1, the partisans raided Mukden and Dainanmon for the second time. They surrounded the arsenal and gave battle. They were only armed with shotguns, rifles and machine guns. A four thousand strong partisan detachment was operating on the South Manchurian Railway near Sokston. On September 2, about 3,000 partisans attacked Kanto Sujka and engaged the Japanese Manchurian troops in a fierce battle. Nine partisans raided Deieskio, the railway track is broken. An armored train sent to the assistance of the Japanese units was compelled to retreat. This is how the partisans are fighting against the Japanese invasion in Manchuria and Mongolia, without sparing themselves." (*Soldier's Friend*, Oct. 3, 1933.)

Despite all its achievements the Party press had nevertheless a number of weak links in its activity. It is not enough to show the defeats that took place at the front. It is necessary that the C.P. of Japan explain systematically and intelligibly to the masses of soldiers and to the workers and peasants, the political meaning of revolutionary defeatism. Efforts should be made to ensure that the masses grasp that the military defeat of the Japanese monarchy is to the advantage of the proletariat and the peasantry, for it shatters the ground under the feet of the ruling classes and creates extensive oppor-

* All the Chinese geographical names are given in Japanese transcription.

tunities for the toiling masses to attack the monarchy and to develop the revolutionary struggle. The propaganda of revolutionary defeatism is all the more necessary since the ruling classes of Japan, as well as all their agents, are increasingly scaring the masses with the danger of defeat, alleging that in such a case Japan would suffer the fate of China, colonial slavery, etc. The ruling classes skilfully utilize this argument for the military mobilization of the masses, for the suppression of the mass discontent of the workers at the enterprises, etc., deftly deceiving inexperienced workers sometimes, who, though not at all anxious to fight, nevertheless think that it is always better to choose the lesser evil.

The struggle against fascism and social-fascism continues to remain the weak link in the activity of the press. In the issues of the *Sekki* which have reached us, we find directives issued to the Party organizations stating that the struggle against the fascists and social-fascists must be developed in the process of carrying out this or that campaign. But there are hardly any popular articles addressed to the mass reader, in which the paper attacks the concrete actions, activity and maneuvers of the fascists or exposes the fascization of the social-democratic upper stratum, although by their activity both these groups provide the richest material that could be used against themselves.

As regards the organizational work of the Communist Party in the army and navy, very little is mentioned due to the particularly conspirative nature of this work. In the same number of the *Soldier's Friend* we find an article by a Communist, who tells about his experiences in organizational work in the barracks. Judging from this article the Party members who work in the army transfer the experience they have of the work of the revolutionary representatives at the enterprises.

When he landed in the barracks, the comrade first of all tried to find out the causes of discontent, and the demands of the soldiers. They were found to be as follows: free exit from the barracks; better food; the opportunity to read favorite books and newspapers; supply of three sets of clothes; mechanical laundry; abolition of compulsory training for bayonet fighting; complete abolition of work as domestic servants; wages at the rate of 1 yen per day; restitution of articles lost without any deduction or penalty; freedom of assembly and organization. These were part of the common demands of all the soldiers. In addition to these, there were a number of other demands depending upon the category of the units (infantry, cavalry, sapper troops, transport troops, etc.).

Then, the comrade became acquainted with the men and won authority among them.

> "I began my work," he wrote, "by mapping out the following:
>
> "1. To live on good terms with everybody, and gradually in the course of conversations to find out their moods and their biography.
>
> "2. To strike up a close acquaintanceship, to enjoy the confidence of everybody and to gain their esteem (like the revolutionary representatives in the factories).
>
> "3. Gradually I began to notice the results. Then in the process of getting to know them closer I proceeded to agitation and propaganda. For instance, when a great deal of laundering was to be done, I helped in the washing, saying that more time should be given for laundry, that washing should be done by machinery, and led the conversation from washing to the exposure of the essence of the army."

The comrade very soon observed the results. All kinds of questions which troubled the recruits in the company were discussed with him and when any difficulties arose as to what was to be done, they applied to him, while disputes arising between the recruits and the old soldiers were referred to him.

Then the comrade became the leader of the masses.

> "I set myself," he wrote, "the task of always being the head of everybody. This had to be carried out in the army with the greatest caution. You must not be either an extreme Left or an opportunist. You must without fail reflect the mood of everybody, linking up the common interests with the everyday requirements. I will give an example. On Sunday, this joyful day for the army, when the soldiers went on furlough, the young soldiers had a lot of work left. And it frequently happened that notwithstanding their great desire to go out, the new recruits refused to go out because they did not want to be together with the sergeants and the two-year-service men. They would have been more courageous had they been in larger numbers. Therefore, in spite of the abuse of the sergeants and of the two-year-service men I began to go on leave each time, attracting the timorous ones with me. This joint leave, which lasted several hours, made it possible to make the proper use of the time."

Thus was the ground prepared for the setting up of a soldiers' committee.

The Communists and the revolutionary workers, who conducted anti-war work in the army units, showed a great deal of courage and inventiveness. Last January, in the 3rd battalion of the 7th regiment stationed in the City of Iticava, two soldiers were arrested, who were formerly workers, functionaries of the Dsenkaio. Not only did they themselves conduct work with the new recruits, but they succeeded in making the barracks accessible to other comrades. The bourgeois newspapers which re-

ported their arrest, wrote: "Their daring went so far, that the Communists used to visit them directly in the battalion, as their friends, and thus the meetings took place openly in front of everybody."

In such places where it was not yet possible to penetrate right into the very unit, the work was carried on from outside; they found out where the soldiers of the given barracks were in the habit of going on Sundays, such as the favorite soldiers' saloons, etc., acquaintances were made, and connections were established. One bourgeois newspaper tells of this kind of work of a group of Communists and of Young Communists in Tsiba:

> "They directed their efforts to the Bolshevization of the army units. They tried to strike up acquaintances with the soldiers, who went on furlough on Sundays, invited them to the restaurants, and conducted conversations and agitated." (*Sutz*, July 18, 1933.)

Along with their activity in the units in the barracks, the Communists organized activity among the workers and the village youth, who were soon to enter the barracks. Reports about this appear in the bourgeois press from time to time, which publish police information about the investigations into the cases of arrested Party members.

Several teachers of primary schools were arrested in the Ibrarski prefecture last June. They made use of the opportunity to penetrate to the points where new recruits received preliminary training (where the teachers are generally invited to teach in addition to their basic occupation, and sometimes gratis, as a "social duty") and developed anti-war agitation among the recruits there. (*Sikai Undo Simbun* of July 1, 1933.)

The same newspaper reports that in the Ivakuney district the Party members and the members of the proletarian cultural organizations carried on work among the youth of recruiting age: "They organized gatherings of the youth leaving for military service. At these gatherings they recited anti-army poems and anti-war songs. They urged the peasants to participate in the joint tilling of the land of the recruits' families, and so forth". (*Sikai Undo Simbun* of Oct. 1, 1934.)

The bourgeois Japanese press hushes up the activity of the Communists in the army. Later on, sometimes a half year, or even a year later, when the police have lifted the prohibition*, empty articles appear in the papers calculated to arouse sensation and to frighten the philistines.

But the Communist Party of Japan bravely conducts its heroic work in the army, at the front and inside the country. The Japanese Bolsheviks are for the third year holding high the banner of struggle to turn the imperialist war into a civil war, into a national revolution against the monarchy for rice, land, and liberty.

It was they who stood at the hand of the memorable soldiers' riots in Kakey, in Shanghai and in Dzinkoo. It is they who conduct inconspicuous painstaking work on board the men-of-war and in the barracks to disintegrate the most powerful apparatus of Japanese imperialism — the "Emperor's Army".

Their experience, accumulated at the price of hundreds of the best revolutionary lives and of thousands of years of hard labor and imprisonment, deserves to be studied and popularized by the fraternal Communist Parties.

---

* It is customary to forbid the publication of any information about arrest until the end of the inquiry.